the African Communist

Published quarterly in the interests of
African solidarity, and as a forum for
Marxist-Leninist thought throughout
our Continent, by the
South African Communist Party

Vol 2 No 4 • July-Sept. 1963

in this issue

EDITORIAL NOTES

AFRICAN UNITY MOVES CLOSER:
The Summit Conference;
East African Victory; Bury the Corpse **3**

APARTHEID — U. S. STYLE **6**

BRITAIN IN SOUTH AFRICA **9**

SOUTH AFRICA IS AT WAR **13** *A. Lerumo*

AFRICA AND INDUSTRIALISATION **23** *Jack Woddis*

BRITAIN AND S. AFRICA **36** *John Gollan*

SECRETS OF THE CONGO **53** *Charles P. Howard*

***MARXIST-LENINIST STUDY** **67** *Terence Africanus*
A Note on Mr. Mboya's 'Socialism'

***DOCUMENTS:**

NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA **73** *A. J. Lutuli*

THIS IS COMMUNISM **81** *Fidel Castro*

READERS' LETTERS

AFRICAN UNITY MOVES CLOSER | The Summit

BEFORE THE HEADS of our thirty Independent African States met at the Summit Conference at Addis Ababa in May, imperialist 'experts' were freely—and wishfully—predicting that it was headed for failure. Much was made of differences between our leaders and countries on various problems, including the manner, degree and pace at which African Unity should be implemented. No one can deny such differences. But the colonialists reckoned without the central factor—the strength of the will for unity among African people everywhere, which could not but have its effect upon and be expressed by our leaders. It was this factor which succeeded in resolving most of the differences, in the achievement of agreed solutions of all the most important problems facing the Conference, and in making Addis Ababa 1963 a great occasion in the annals of African history.

Addis Ababa 1963 did not, and could not reasonably have been expected to, achieve the immediate proclamation and formation of African Union, if by that we mean the full political and economic integration of our Continent. It could not do so for a number of reasons—chief among which is the fact that a huge area, populated by millions of our people and containing some of our richest assets, is still severed from the body of Mother Africa and forcibly occupied by Portuguese, White South African and Rhodesian, British and other colonialists. So long as these criminal regimes continue, the accomplishment of genuine all-African unity is impossible. That is exactly why, as their foremost task, the sovereign African States addressed themselves to the duty and responsibility of carrying the opening phase of the African Revolution to its fulfilment and completion by assisting the populations of South Africa, 'Rhodesia', Angola, Mozambique and other enslaved countries to win freedom and independence from colonialist rule.

That is what Ben Bella of Algeria meant when he said it was more important at this stage to establish a blood-bank for freedom fighters

than to set up an all-African Development Bank; that is why Emperor Haile Selassie told the delegates: 'Africans in the Rhodesias, Mozambique and Angola as well as in South Africa cry out in anguish for the support and help of the African leaders': and Julius Nyerere said: 'The time for allowing our brethren to struggle unaided is gone'.

Practical effect is being given to these views by decisions to create a fund for concerted financial assistance to the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa, to step up the African and international movement to isolate the South African and Portuguese regimes, to boycott their trade, their ships and aircraft, their diplomats and their consuls. Ethiopia, Algeria, Uganda, the U.A.R., Tanganyika, Congo (Leopoldville), Guinea, Senegal and Nigeria are to form a special committee with headquarters at Dar-es-Salaam, to harmonise and co-ordinate assistance from African states for our freedom fighters in the remaining unfree areas of our continent.

Another most important contribution of the Addis Ababa summit towards African unity was that it sees the end of conflicting 'blocs' of African states. A permanent machinery has been established to effect closer co-operation and co-ordination between all the independent states, and a number of important practical conclusions were reached in view of 'the imperative necessity for African countries to pool their resources and harmonise their activities in the economic field'.

The resolutions on Africa and the United Nations and demanding 'general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control'—like the whole tone and tenor of the conference—were militant, anti-colonialist, and filled with the spirit of African patriotism.

Addis Ababa, 1963, therefore marked an important and historic milestone on the road to African Unity.

But it also showed that that road still has a long and difficult stretch ahead before we reach our goal—and that the road has to run through Salisbury, Cape Town, Lourenço Marques and Luanda before it is ended.

VICTORY IN EAST AFRICA

Hardly was the Summit Conference over when yet another great landmark was scored up for the cause of African Freedom—the sweeping victory of Jomo Kenyatta and his Kenya African National Union.

Like all patriotic Africans, we of the AFRICAN COMMUNIST rejoice at

this splendid news and extend our heartiest congratulations to Prime Minister Kenyatta, the grand old man of our liberation struggle, who spent so many years of his life in the dungeons of British imperialism. It is typical of his militancy and revolutionary spirit that he immediately appointed Odinga Oginga, the very man whom Whitehall had vetoed for Cabinet rank, as his first Home Minister.

Hardly was the new Cabinet installed than leaders from Tanganyika, Uganda, Somalia and Zanzibar were busy in Nairobi, elaborating practical plans to build a new East African Federation which will soon eliminate the troublesome 'border' problems which imperialism, with its traditional policy of 'divide and rule' had created with the purpose of getting African brothers to fight one another. Here, swiftly and in action, we saw the meaning of the Spirit of Addis Ababa.

How powerfully now, and uninterruptedly, our African Revolution is gaining strength, purpose, direction and impetus!

The scandal of British troops flying from bases in Kenya to suppress the Swazi people was met by a vigorous demand from KANU for immediate independence and the abolition of foreign bases. And Britain will not be able long to withstand this demand.

Africa is coming back. Beware, Welensky! Pas op, Verwoerd!

DISINTEGRATING FEDERATION

The East African Federation is being born, amid the rejoicing of the African people.

With equal rejoicing we greet the death of the 'Central African Federation', that misshapen abortion resulting from the illicit union between Salisbury and Whitehall, and designed to perpetuate White domination in Central Africa under the label of a federation.

As we write these lines the Victoria Falls Conference has commenced, its object being to dismantle Welensky's federal apparatus which has been contemptuously rejected as unwanted by the people of all three areas.

To all intents and purposes, the C.A.F. is already dead. It remains only to bury the corpse, which already stinks most offensively.

All the same, we cannot overlook the fact that some people are extremely anxious to keep at least the ghost of 'Federation' alive, not least Sir Roy himself, who knows that, politically speaking, he will not be able to survive the burial of the sickly child he fathered.

Behind the scenes these people are battling at the Victoria Falls,

manoeuvring and scheming to keep at least some Federal 'Ministries' going on the pretext of 'avoiding dislocation'.

It is obvious that Mr. Kaunda and Dr. Banda will not be taken in by such transparent manoeuvres.

How can you have 'Ministries' without a Government?

As long as a single Department is controlled from Salisbury so long Blantyre and Ndola will not be truly and fully independent.

We saw in the great victory at Ndola when the African people successfully prevented the deportation of South African freedom-fighters to Salisbury—en route for Beit Bridge and the Republic—that the Federation is disintegrating and can no longer stand up to vigorous and united African opposition.

Now, let there be an end to it. A clean break, so that we may go forward to the great tasks ahead without being distracted by ghosts of the past.

APARTHEID—U.S. STYLE

'The price of the liberation of the white people is the liberation of the blacks—the total liberation, in the cities, in the towns, before the law and in the mind.'

—James Baldwin, American Negro author.

THE RECENT MILITANT demonstrations by people of African descent in Birmingham, Alabama, and other areas in the Southern states of the USA has brought home once again to people in this continent the intolerable discrimination to which our brothers and sisters are subjected in this wealthy imperialist country which claims to be the leader of the 'free world'.

White Americans in these states, businessmen, senators, mayors, governors, policemen, farmers and even ordinary workers, behave with a hooligan racial arrogance and determination to preserve white domination and exclusiveness which is only paralleled in Verwoerd's Republic of South Africa.

The theory and practice of apartheid within the United States is a source of serious embarrassment to the American ruling class. They cannot but be acutely conscious of the shattering blow to United States influence and prestige which these incidents and manifestations constitute, not only in Africa but wherever people value human rights and dignity and the charter of the United Nations. It is for this reason that President Kennedy and other statesmen of United States imperial-

ism continue to express high-sounding sentiments about the right of the Negro people to equality of legal rights, and so forth. The administration in Washington has even gone so far as to send federal troops to safeguard the brave Negro children and students who venture their lives by entering Whites-only schools and universities, and to curb some of the worst excesses of white hooliganism condoned and even organised by the governments of the Southern states.

But the United States ruling class continue to take refuge behind the alleged peculiarities of their country's constitution, and the rights to autonomy of the Southern states.

The African people, who at last in most of this great Continent have expelled colonialism and taken their destiny and government into their own strong hands, will no longer continue to tolerate oppression and discrimination of African people anywhere in the world, whether in Johannesburg, South Africa or Birmingham, Alabama—or for that matter in New York.

For, although the Afro-American may not suffer *legal* discrimination in the Northern states as he does in the South, it is a notorious international scandal that everywhere in the United States Negroes suffer discrimination. They do not receive the same opportunities in education and employment as their White fellow-citizens. They do not get any but the hardest and worst paid of jobs, and when there is unemployment they are the first to be hit. Discriminatory practices exist in a score of fields, including residential areas and social facilities, so that our brothers and sisters in New York are in practice confined to slums and locations like Harlem. Although one out of every ten United States citizens is of African descent, hardly any are to be found in the national and state legislatures, in the civil service, the judiciary or the upper ranks of commerce and industry.

Small wonder that the heads of our independent states at their solemn conference at Addis Ababa decided that Free Africa cannot sit back silent in the face of this continuing scandal. The Conference expressed the '*deep concern aroused in all African peoples and governments by the measures of racial discrimination against communities of African origin living outside the continent and particularly in the United States of America*'. The resolution pointed out that '*these intolerable malpractices are likely seriously to deteriorate relations between the African peoples and governments on the one hand and the people and government of the United States of America on the other*'.

The resolution also expressed 'appreciation' for the efforts of the US Federal Government to put an end to these 'intolerable malpractices'. But, at the same time, it should not be forgotten that in the

eyes of the African people such efforts are too few, too slow and too ineffective.

We are not impressed by excuses about the peculiarities of the constitution of the United States. If the rulers of that country were seriously concerned to end Jim Crow practices, they are powerful enough and influential enough to do so. When the big business interests who are the real rulers of the USA are aroused and serious they command a machine of propaganda, pressure and influence which none can afford to ignore, from the national legislature at Washington to the state and municipal rulers in every corner of the country. One only needs to look at the vicious and thorough job these gentlemen have done on the so-called threat of Communism and its gallant and irrepressible defenders in the USA. The most extreme, and unconstitutional, legislation has been passed through the legislature and upheld by the US Supreme Court making Communism a crime punishable by the severest penalties. All the weapons of indoctrination, from television, radio and press to the churches and schools have been harnessed in an all-out drive to spread poisonous lies against Marxism-Leninism. The entire nation has been saturated in this poison, so that it is difficult for a Communist to lead a normal life or find employment in this citadel of the 'free world', and so that it is hard to find an American inside or outside the United States who has not been infected by the madness of obsessive fear and hatred of 'the Reds'.

If America's rulers were really interested it would not be at all difficult for them to harness the same machine of propaganda and pressure to a really worthy cause—the eradication of racialism, that cancer at the heart of the American body politic. The fact that they do not do so shows all too clearly to us Africans that their professions of devotion to the principle of equality and human dignity are sheer hypocrisy. They use the same pious expressions to condemn South Africa and apartheid at the United Nations and elsewhere, and then proceed in their actions to protect Verwoerd and cover up for him.

When Kennedy, President of the United States, gives utterance to high-sounding declarations about his concern with the plight of our African-descended brothers and sisters in his country, but explains that he cannot do anything about it because of the constitution, we cannot help being reminded about a great predecessor in that high office, Abraham Lincoln, who one hundred years ago, in 1863, declared that African slavery was intolerable in the United States and used the full force of the Federal Government to end it—disregarding the whines of the slave-owning Southern gentry about 'states' rights'.

There is no constitution of any country anywhere which entitles people and governments to oppress Africans because their forefathers

came from our continent. That is the highest law—the law of the United Nations. It overrides any constitution, from Cape Town to Alabama. And we the people of Africa are going to see that this law is enforced.

It is not our job to work out or worry about what legal or technical means President Kennedy and his friends will use to implement the United Nations Charter. But until they do so, they will find that Africans in every part of this Continent will react with increasing impatience, indignation and cynicism whenever US representatives, 'peace corps' volunteers, and the hundreds of others who have come here from the United States, attempt, as they never weary of doing, to tell us how we should run our countries and of their own devotion to the principles of democracy, freedom and human brotherhood.

BRITAIN IN SOUTH AFRICA

People tend to forget when speaking of South Africa that the term includes not only Verwoerd's Republic but also the three British High Commission territories of Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland. And though British Government representatives at Lake Success and elsewhere are prone to utter high-sounding platitudes about the 'winds of change', and the evils of apartheid, their own practice in these South African colonies differs little in essence from that of their powerful neighbour across the borders. Under British rule economic development in the three territories has languished to such an extent that more than half their men are always absent from home working on the Witwatersrand Gold Mines and elsewhere in the Republic. They do not do this because they are attracted by conditions in Vorster's police state where a black man is treated like a dog, but because their only alternative is starvation.

The British authorities make much of the alleged lack of racial discrimination in the High Commission territories. And it is true that, unlike the Republic, an African may go into a hotel or buy a drink in the bar. But although these more obvious signs of segregation have been removed of recent years in the territories, there is plenty of race discrimination to be found in all of them for those who keep their eyes open. This is particularly true of Bechuanaland and Swaziland where there are fairly substantial white populations—most of them Afrikaners from the Republic—owning the best land and playing a prominent and most unhealthy part in the economic and political life of the territories. Despite much 'constitutional' window-dressing,

British imperialism is strongly resisting the mounting pressure that has developed among the people of the High Commission territories for democratic self-government and independence. The myth assiduously spread by the British Government that they are the benefactors of the African people, helping them along the slow but 'orderly' path to independence has been rudely shattered by recent events in Swaziland. A mass general strike of the Swazi people—beginning over economic demands of the asbestos miners and the sweated labourers in the sugar plantations, but developing into a full-scale political strike for independence—has been ruthlessly suppressed by British troops. These troops were flown in from Kenya, permission to overfly 'their' territories having been first sought and immediately granted by Welensky and Verwoerd respectively. The background to this scandalous action must be sought partly in the recent 'consitutional' talks about Swaziland and her future which were held in London. The British imperial government claimed that it was inviting 'all parties' to these talks. In fact those who were invited were the representatives of the handful of White settlers in Swaziland: most of them, in fact, citizens of the Republic; of the Ngwenyama Chief Sobhuza: whose feudal despotism is more and more unpopular with his people, and hence more and more dependent upon the support of the White settlers and the British Administration; and the representatives of certain Swazi political parties, including the Nququ faction of the Swaziland Democratic Party. Dr. Zwane and Mr. Dhlamini and other representatives of the Swaziland Progressive Part ywere not invited—the excuse being that the British administration did not consider them 'sufficiently representative'. While the talks were going on in London, however, these leaders showed which was the truly representative organisation by leading the masses of the Swazi nation in the most dynamic and spectacular demonstration that has ever taken place in that country.

And the Swazi gentlemen in London who were posing as the spokesmen of the Swazi people were demonstrating how *un*representative they were by accepting the most outrageous constitutional proposals which are a travesty of democracy and independence. Two-thirds or more of the new legislative council established by this Constitution will be made up of representatives of the White minority and nominees of Chief Sobhuza. The principle of one man—or one woman—one vote has been trampled in the dust.

The workers of the Havelock mine and the White-owned sugar fields of Swaziland have learnt full well that they will never get justice from the British administration or from a settler and British dominated 'Legco' as proposed in the London talks. That is why their strike for

higher wages and better conditions was transformed into a massive political demonstration for true independence. The strike was broken by British troops. But the same action also broke the new constitution and whatever confidence the Swazi people may have had in British goodwill and promises.

The lesson will not be lost either upon the people of Basutoland and Bechuanaland. They do not want British imperialism either as a ruler or as a 'protector'.

British imperialism makes much of its role as the alleged 'protector' of the territories against the threat of aggression and incorporation by Verwoerd's Republic. And indeed, there is such a threat. But Britain is doing nothing to resist it, in fact she is working hand in glove with Verwoerd and if the people of the three countries are to resist aggression from their big and powerfully armed neighbour, they would be ill advised to rely on British imperialism for aid.

What are the consequences of British colonial rule in the High Commission territories in relation to the threat from Pretoria?

Economically all three territories are dependent upon the apartheid regime in Pretoria. They have no industries and are entirely dependent on the export of labour to and the import of manufactures from the Republic. Their agriculture has been allowed to remain so backward that even foodstuffs have to be imported into these entirely agricultural areas. The British have not even constructed a single modern airfield which would enable friends of African freedom in the independent states and the United Nations to fly in supplies and assistance in the event of the Republic declaring a blockade. Britain has done nothing to assist or prepare the people of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland to resist and defend themselves in the event of a military invasion. There are no substantial armed forces and there is no training and defence equipment available to the indigenous people in the face of the alarming and powerful military build-up by their greedy and imperialistic neighbour—the Republic of South Africa.

Independent Swaziland, Bechuanaland and Basutoland would quickly repair this dangerous weakness. Instead of relying on the broken reed of British imperialism—itself deeply involved in the maintenance of the apartheid regime in South Africa—they would be able to look to their own defences and to call on the aid of the rest of Africa and the whole world in resistance to Verwoerd's aggressive plans and actions.

So far from resisting these plans and actions, the British authorities in the High Commission territories are leaning over backwards in their efforts to appease Pretoria. Political refugees from South Africa are subjected to humiliating and arbitrary bans which can only be compared

to those of Vorster himself, they are refused residence rights and even declared prohibited immigrants—for no other reason than that of their unpopularity with the Verwoerd Government. The British are not a help to the defence of the High Commission territories against Pretoria's imperialistic appetites. In fact, they are a hindrance, a menace, and a fifth column of Verwoerdism. The territories cannot defend their independence from the Republic until they have won independence from Britain.

This is an urgent matter which cannot be delayed. Already the Verwoerd regime is making military preparations along the borders. It is clearing away the bush and installing armed units with modern equipment along the frontiers of Bechuanaland, Basutoland and Swaziland. It is mobilising for war, and only the blind can fail to see it.

Only independence now can save the High Commission territories from being swallowed up by the criminal regime of Verwoerd and Vorster. The Basuto, Bechuana and Swazi people cannot afford to wait for interminable constitutional talks in Whitehall, while their countries are in mortal danger of aggression.

Independence has become a matter of life and death, a matter of survival.

THE IMPERIALIST CONSPIRACY

'Every step in the decolonialisation of our continent has brought greater resistance in those areas where colonial garrisons are available to colonialism.

'This is the great design of the imperialist interests that buttress colonialism and neo-colonialism, and we would be deceiving ourselves in the most cruel way were we to regard their individual actions as separate and unrelated. When Portugal violates Senegal's border, when Verwoerd allocates one-seventh of South Africa's budget to military and police, when France builds as part of her defence policy an interventionist force that can intervene, more especially in French-speaking Africa, when Welensky talks of Southern Rhodesia joining South Africa, when Britain sends arms to South Africa, it is all part of a carefully calculated pattern working towards a single end: the continued enslavement of our still dependent brothers and an onslaught upon the independence of our sovereign African States.'

—Dr. Kwame Nkrumah—President of Ghana.
In his address to the Conference of Heads of African States, Addis Ababa, May 24th, 1963.

SOUTH AFRICA IS AT WAR

A. Lerumo

THE VERWOERD-VORSTER DICTATORSHIP is already at war. It has declared war on the people of our country and it increasingly menaces the whole of Free Africa beyond our borders. Under the leadership of Umkonto We Sizwe, our people have already taken the path of resistance and revolt; they are acting, arming, training and preparing for victory in our war of liberation.

Without full consciousness of this essential fact we cannot properly assess either the present or the future of developments in South Africa. For this fact changes and modifies everything. Violent struggle has its own laws and its own logic, and although these are similar and analogous to those of non-violent struggle, they are different from them in important respects.

It is the purpose of this article to deal with one aspect only of the far-reaching implications and consequences of the South African War of National Liberation: that is, the international aspect.

From its very nature, origins and aims, the South African struggle is not and cannot be confined to the borders of our country alone. The aggressive apartheid regime is, and has been declared by the United Nations to be, a threat to world peace. It is dependent upon and closely linked with the international forces of imperialism and colonialism. It threatens, in the first place, the peace, unity, progress and independence of the African Continent. And, as stated in *The Road to South African Freedom*:

In fighting against White supremacy, for the democratic revolution in South Africa, the people of our country are fighting for the cause of the African Revolution as a whole.

WHO ARE OUR FRIENDS—AND WHO ARMS OUR ENEMIES?

War is a great clarifier of issues and destroyer of illusions. And in this war—a war which we did not choose and which was forced upon

us because we prefer death to slavery—the people of South Africa are learning very rapidly and sharply to distinguish who are our friends and who are our enemies. It is a lesson the rest of Africa will be quick to appreciate as well. In the many debates which are an inevitable part of the process of achieving African unity, one point is clear and beyond discussion: those who ally themselves with Verwoerd are the enemies of Africa.

What is it that has thus far enabled the criminal apartheid regime in South Africa, supported by less than three million Whites, successfully to hold down 12 million non-Whites and defy the feelings of the whole of Africa and the overwhelming majority of mankind?

The answer is clear. **The Verwoerd regime is maintained in power by the assistance, economic, political, diplomatic and military, of the imperialist powers, of N.A.T.O.** Who invests in South Africa and has a stake in the maintenance of apartheid? Who trades with South Africa? Who supplies armaments and military equipment to South Africa? Let us look at some of the facts.

White South Africa today is virtually on a war basis. Military expenditure has increased from R36 million* in 1961 to R156 million for 1963—and to this must be added a further R200 million for the militarised police and security services. Between 1962 and 1963 the quantity of aircraft, bombs and ammunition acquired by South Africa was more than doubled.

The chief culprit assisting White South Africa to arm against the people of our country is *Britain*.

ARMS FACTORIES

In 1962, with the blessing of the United Kingdom Government, Imperial Chemical Industries contributed a capital investment of £10 million sterling, plus its considerable technical assistance and knowledge, for the building of new armament factories in South Africa. The Verwoerd regime is preparing feverishly to accelerate local weapons production.

Yet, although it is the most highly-industrialised part of Africa, South Africa remains dependent on imports for modern armaments. From Britain she has received, or is receiving, military aircraft (including *Buccaneer* Naval Bombers, *Canberra Mark 12* Jet Bombers, *Westland Wasp* and *Auster* helicopters, and *Vampire*, *Shackleton*, *Dove*, *Heron* and *Viscount* aircraft), armoured cars (including the notorious *Saracens* used by S.A. police at Sharpeville

* R2 (two rands) in South African currency = £1 sterling.

and elsewhere) and naval vessels (including *President* class warships).

Britain also helps South Africa in other ways. She is training South African paratroopers and supplying Verwoerd with espionage and 'security' information, including reports on the movement of South African freedom-fighters outside the Republic.

Sir Hugh Stephenson, the new British Ambassador to South Africa, declared in May 1963 soon after his arrival: 'We have mutual strategic links which are very important.' The nature of these 'strategic links' became very apparent in June 1963, a month later, when Britain applied for and was immediately granted permission to fly troops from Kenya over the Republic to suppress African strikers and demonstrators in Swaziland.

OTHER NATO ARMS

Not only Britain but also the other NATO powers are active in supplying military equipment to South Africa. The *United States* supplies *Lockheed Hercules* and *Cessna* aircraft, as well as other important items. Recently the State Department queried certain military supplies to Verwoerd, but withdrew its objection on the absurd 'assurance' that the arms were not for attack but defence. *France* has furnished *Mirage* jet fighters, air-to-ground missiles and other weapons. *La Carbone*, French armament firm, is setting up a factory in South Africa to make rocket missile equipment.

Belgium has granted Verwoerd licence rights to manufacture the F.N. automatic rifle, which is standard equipment for NATO troops. West Germany has recently supplied 63 troop carriers for the S.A. army. NATO powers have supplied a variety of light and heavy tanks to South Africa.

These facts show very clearly from whom Verwoerd is getting the weapons with which to suppress the South African people, and conduct an aggressive policy against Africa and world peace.

Recently, an attempt was made by the colonialist powers to use the old technique of a thief shouting 'stop thief!' to distract attention from himself. Inspired reports were spread in the Western press that Czechoslovakia and the German Democratic Republic had entered into agreements to supply arms to South Africa. The Governments of both countries issued official and categorical denials. A.D.N., official German news agency, issued a statement on June 22, 1963, describing the reports as 'completely untrue', and cited the Foreign Trade Ministry as declaring: 'The German Democratic Republic has not delivered military equipment such as arms to South Africa at

any time. No official contracts or agreements on the goods existed between the two countries, nor was it intended to conclude any.'

AID AND COMFORT

The imperialist powers, in addition to flagrant and direct military assistance, amounting to intervention, also provide aid and comfort to the bloodstained Verwoerd regime in a number of other ways.

It is no longer possible for them openly and directly to support and excuse apartheid at the United Nations and other international gatherings. Attending the United Nations Trusteeship Committee last year, Mr. Patrick Wall of Britain said apartheid was 'morally abominable, intellectually grotesque and spiritually indefensible'. Similar high-sounding condemnations came from United States and other imperialist representatives.

The hypocrisy of such talk was exposed for all to see, however, when the crucial 'sanctions' resolution was placed before the General Assembly. This historic resolution was passed by 67 votes to 16. It called on all U.N. members to break diplomatic relations with and to end the passage of ships and aircraft to and from South Africa; to cut off trade, including arms and ammunition supply. It asked the Security Council to impose sanctions to compel South Africa's compliance with U.N. resolutions and to consider her expulsion.

Britain, the United States and France opposed the resolution. (The rest of the 'sixteen' were: Portugal, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, Greece, Spain, Ireland—all European Common Market countries; Australia, Canada, New Zealand—of the British Commonwealth; and disgracefully two 'non-white' countries whose representatives bowed down to lick Verwoerd's boots—Turkey and Japan. And of course the representative from 'South Africa'.) That was the line-up at Lake Success last November.

And, though soundly beaten on the vote by 67—16, these Western gentlemen, who are always giving us sermons on 'democracy', 'fair play' and so forth, have continued to ignore, defy and sabotage the solemn United Nations Resolution ever since.

They continue to harbour Verwoerd ambassadors and diplomats and maintain their representatives in Pretoria and Cape Town.

Britain, the United States, France, Italy, West Germany, Japan and other capitalist countries are not only keeping up their thriving trade with South Africa, but even expanding it. Their ships and planes throng South African seaports and airports, and their own ports welcome craft from the Verwoerd Republic.

Above all, as we have seen, they continue to deliver into the hands

of Fouché, Verwoerd's Defence Minister, the very weapons, planes, tanks, bombs and firearms to murder African patriots and freedom-fighters and innocent African men, women and children.

WE ARE NOT ALONE

The Nationalist Party Government of South Africa relies very heavily on its imperialist friends abroad—not only the shaky and tottering regimes of Welensky and Salazar, but also, and behind them, too, the powerful forces of Britain, the United States and the NATO military alliance. 'Look,' boasts Verwoerd, 'we are not isolated. We are a part of the "free world" [save the mark!] and they will not let us down.' There is some truth in this boast—but it is not the whole truth.

For we, the oppressed and exploited people of South Africa, are also not alone. We have staunch and true friends beyond our borders, friends ready to fight with us and die with us in the cause of African freedom. Our friends are in every continent and in every country, even in the countries that are ruled by the allies and partners of Verwoerd. And—while Verwoerd's friends are interested only in money they get from the profits of apartheid and will rat on him as soon as his ship begins to leak—ours are true allies and comrades who will stand by our side through thick and thin until victory is won for freedom.

First and closest among our friends are the people of the whole Continent of Africa ; both our comrades-in-arms on our borders, in South-West, the High Commission and Rhodesian and Portuguese-occupied lands of Africa, joined with us in the common struggle for independence from White rule, and also our brothers and sisters of Free Africa, the independent sovereign states of our continent, to whom our bondage in the Slave South is an intolerable insult and an ever-increasing threat.

The hundreds of millions of the nations of Asia are also on our side. Though they may have unfortunate and deep differences among themselves they are truly united at least on one point: apartheid is an insufferable affront to human dignity. South Africans will always remember with gratitude that newly-independent India brought this country's rulers before the dock of the United Nations for the first time when she raised the treatment of persons of Indian origin in what was then General Smuts's South Africa, and Asian countries have consistently supported resolutions and measures against apart-

heid at Afro-Asian and other world forums. In all of Asia, only the monopoly-capitalist rulers of Japan have sunk so low as to drag the national dignity of their country in the dust for the sake of doing business with South Africa's anti-Asian racists.

The one-third of humanity within the socialist camp, together with millions of Communists and class-conscious workers of other countries, remain loyal to the 1960 Statement of 81 Communist and Workers' Parties that their meeting:

'. . . indignantly condemns apartheid, the inhuman system of racial persecution and tyranny in South Africa, and urges democrats throughout the world actively to support the people of South Africa in their struggle for freedom and equality.'

The socialist countries vigorously supported the United Nations resolution on sanctions, and similar resolutions and measures at Afro-Asian, international labour and other conferences. Neither Verwoerd nor his opponents stand in the slightest doubt where communists, socialists and the entire labour movement stand in relation to the epic struggle for the liberation of South Africa.

AFRICA AND THE SLAVE SOUTH

Non-Africans, including some progressives, often underestimate and fail to understand the passion and depth with which every African patriot feels on the subject of South Africa. They imagine it is mainly a matter of sympathy with victims of oppression, and when, for example, Africans stage a walk-out from a conference in protest against the presence of a Verwoerd spokesman, they perhaps think they are 'going too far'.

Of course, it *is* a question of sympathy with victims of oppression. The mad-dog tyranny of Pretoria has thrown caution and appearances to the winds; it is hunting tens of thousands of Africans and other non-whites from their homes as if they were animals; it is jailing scores of freedom-fighters, as well as their wives and children, without charge or trial; its filthy racialistic theories and practices are an intolerable insult to human dignity and freedom everywhere.

But it is also *more* than a question of sympathy and protest against a brutal tyranny. The apartheid regime is not only at war with the people of South Africa itself; it is at war with the whole of Africa. In the words of *South Africa's Road to Freedom*:

'The struggle of the peoples of the rest of Africa and those of South Africa . . . is one and indivisible. White colonialism in the Republic

of South Africa threatens the independence, peace and progress of the whole of Africa. [South Africa] is a stronghold and a refuge of imperialism, threatening the gains of the African Revolution; a breeding-ground for plots and activities designed to restore colonialism throughout the continent. . . .'

South Africa has already illegally annexed South-West Africa. It supports and upholds British rule in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland; white minority domination in 'Rhodesia'; Portuguese fascist domination in Mozambique and Angola. But that is not all. The massive military build-up in South Africa creates a military unbalance which cannot be ignored anywhere on the Continent. Verwoerd's long-range bombers and naval development pose both an immediate and a potential threat to the peace, security and independence of every state in Free Africa.

A MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

Nor is this a military question alone. In a most profound sense the liberation of South Africa is a matter of life and death for African survival and the African Revolution, as a whole.

We, the people of Africa, have set ourselves some most important goals, from which there is no turning backwards; goals which we must achieve in the lifetime of the present generation if our motherland and our peoples are to take their rightful place in the world, and not to be thrust back again into the living death of servitude and foreign conquest.

Among these goals are: the eradication of colonialism and its resulting backwardness, poverty and weakness, from every corner of our Mother Africa; unity, political, economic, military, cultural, in a vast common creative effort to feed, house and clothe all our people, to open to all the doors of learning and culture so that all may rise to their full stature, to harness our rivers and water our deserts so we may make Africa a garden for her sons and daughters; to secure peace, happiness and freedom for our people and for all humanity.

But none of these goals can be secured while the iron heel of the oppressor remains in Southern Africa.

How can we think of a United Africa while so large a part of the body is severed from the rest? Plans for economic integration and development must lag and be distorted while the great natural wealth and the rich development created by African labour are held under alien control in the South. There can never be peace or

security, there can never be assured and complete independence, so long as the colonialist régime in Pretoria, armed, militarized and mobilised for aggression plans and intrigues to restore colonialism and White domination.

So long as that régime endures there can be no peace in Africa and the world. So long as the people of the South are enslaved, no African anywhere is truly free.

ACCOMPLICES AND PARTNERS

These are the profoundly important reasons which led the Heads of State at the recent Addis Ababa meeting to decide upon resolute practical assistance to the freedom-fighters of Southern Africa and Portuguese-occupied Africa. The whole African people know that they are involved and committed in South Africa's War of National Liberation, that our struggle is theirs.

This new and powerful understanding is a factor that Verwoerd's colonialist backers will ignore at their peril. For as the war in South Africa mounts in intensity and bitterness, their position will become more and more untenable. The logic of warfare is simple and straightforward: if you help the enemy, you are also an enemy.

Why, let us ask, do Britain, the U.S. and their NATO partners support Verwoerd? Why do they resist sanctions and other collective action against South Africa and when even they cannot defend its abominable crimes talk soothingly about 'methods of persuasion' and hide behind legal quibbles about the United Nations Charter? Why do they traffic with Verwoerd and send him arms to kill our people?

The blunt and simple truth is that these great and hypocritical Powers who are always blathering about the 'free world' have *a vested interest in apartheid*. What, after all, is the essence of this hated apartheid? It is the blatant robbery of African wealth and the merciless exploitation of 'cheap' African labour. *And British, American and other imperialists are profiting hugely by this robbery and slavery*. British capitalists have £1,000 million invested in South Africa's mines and other businesses; U.S. financiers about £400 million—more than in the rest of Africa combined. They earn handsome profits—up to 27 per cent. a year. And while Verwoerd does his dirty work of smashing the liberation and trade union movements to make these huge profits possible, U.K. and U.S. spokesmen get up at international congresses and make pious speeches deploring the 'excesses' of apartheid!

No, gentlemen, it won't work any longer. You are sharing and profiting from the 'excesses'; you are accomplices and partners in apartheid.

ANOTHER SIDE OF THE PICTURE

There is another side to this picture. Not all the people of Britain and other imperialist countries—indeed, only a minority section of the capitalists—have investments in the Witwatersrand gold mines. And more and more of the people of these countries are raising their voices in protest against their Governments' policies of aiding and arming Verwoerd. Many of them protest because they feel genuine human sympathy with the suffering and oppressed masses of our people. Others object because they realise that the present policies are fatally injuring and undermining the prestige of 'the West' in Africa and throughout the world.

Recently, Chief A. J. Lutuli, outstanding South African patriot, issued from the little farm where he is confined in Groutville, Natal, a heart-stirring appeal 'to the nations and governments of the world, particularly those giving aid and encouragement to this contemptible Nationalist régime:

'Cast aside your hypocrisy and deceit; declare yourself on the side of oppression if that is your secret design. Do not think we will be deceived by your pious protestations as long as you are prepared to condone, assist and actively support the tyranny in our land. The test is your stand on the princple: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.'

Already there are signs that Lutuli's great appeal has not fallen on deaf ears. Mr. Harold Wilson, leader of the Labour Party, has undertaken to stop the traffic in arms to Verwoerd when he becomes Prime Minister of Great Britain, which seems probable in the near future. In France, a country which has not apparently been very conscious of the South African issue, the famous writer Jean-Paul Sartre has launched a new movement for solidarity with our people. The U.S. leading representative at the I.L.O., suddenly awakened to the violence of African feelings about apartheid, has undertaken to press for U.S. support for the expulsion of South Africa from the United Nations.

A brilliant team of African National Congress leaders is now hard at work forcefully pleading the cause of their fellow-countrymen before the nations of the world, and with powerful effect. But, to those pleas, we may add a different note at this time.

HANDS OFF SOUTH AFRICA!

We South Africans are fully capable of dealing with Verwoerd and his South African supporters.

They may have arms and aircraft ; but they are outnumbered and inwardly corrupt ; they lack conviction and a cause worth dying for. As Lutuli has said:

'The Nationalist juggernaut, top heavy with its crushing weight of military might, is crumbling and rotting at the base. Its present show of strength is a façade to hide its hastening decay and doom. . . . We are steeled by oppression and the daily sight of human values being ground underfoot only makes us cherish even more those values.'

The steeled freedom-fighters of our country, whatever the cost in blood and sacrifice, will send this rotten regime crashing to its foundations. What we are asking is that the nations of the world who claim to be our friends should stop helping Verwoerd, thus prolonging our struggle and our agony and increasing that cost of blood and sacrifice. We demand they stop intervening in South Africa.

We are asking for international action to stop the imperialists helping Verwoerd to kill us.

We are not asking for charity. We should like the world to know that we are at war—and we warn that *those who aid the enemy will not escape justice.*

What matters in the class struggle is not the colour of one's skin, but one's ideological and class position. In the countries which have freed themselves from colonial oppression, the struggle will intensify, and it is only with the victory of labour, with the elimination of exploitation of man by man, that the genuine prosperity of the young states will be ensured.

—Nikita S. Khrushchov.

AFRICA AND INDUSTRIALISATION

by JACK WODDIS

AT THE CENTRE of the preoccupations of the governments and people of the independent African states is that of economic growth. Now that some 200 million Africans live under sovereign African governments and no longer under the harsh tyrannical rule of foreign imperialists they are setting their sights on the higher material standards and fuller life which was the main aim of the struggle for national independence.

To appreciate Africa's urge for economic growth one need only look at her present economic and social situation. Africa's 250 million people constitute 8 per cent of the world's population, and they inhabit a continent covering nearly a quarter of the earth's land surface. Africa has enormous mineral resources—copper, gold, diamonds, bauxite, chrome, manganese, cobalt, tin, uranium, iron, coal, as well as a number of rare mineral ores essential to modern industry. She has considerable energy resources—coal in the south, oil and gas in the north (the prospecting now taking place will probably unearth supplies of these in other areas of the continent, too), and water power, especially in the west, centre and east. She has immense and varied timber resources and produces many valuable agricultural items, both foodstuffs and raw materials for industry—cocoa, coffee, palm oil, sisal, pyrethrum, tobacco, cotton, maize, tea, ground nuts and so on.

Yet Africa's share of world output is only 2 per cent. The net value of her annual output is only £9,200 million—about half that of the United Kingdom which has a population only one-fifth that of Africa's. An analysis made in the mid-1950s showed that Africa possessed only 2 per cent of the world's stock of tractors; and she received only 1 per cent of the world's supplies of nitrogenous fertilisers. Latest figures show that Africa produces only 2 per cent of the world's electricity. Africa's per capita income—£40 a year (£32 if we exclude the Republic of South Africa)—is less than one-tenth that of the industrial countries.

These figures are sufficient to show the enormous problem that faces Africa. But for most African states the task is even greater, for the figures for Africa as a whole do not sufficiently bring out the extent to which industrial developments have hitherto been concentrated in a few areas of heavy Western investment and considerable white settlement. One can take the figures for the distribution of electricity produced in Africa in 1957—a sure index of the distribution of industry in Africa.

PRODUCTION OF ELECTRICITY IN SELECTED AFRICAN COUNTRIES AND TERRITORIES

(*In millions of kilowatt-hours*)

1957

Belgian Congo	2,489.0
Nigeria	331.0
Sierra Leone	14.34
Kenya	268.0
Mauritius	43.3
Uganda	148.8
Northern Rhodesia	1,054.0
Nyasaland	9.5
Southern Rhodesia	1,363.0
Ethiopia	72.56
French Equatorial Africa	39.0
Madagascar	62.4
French West Africa	168.0
Ghana	282.0
Liberia	30.54
Angola	95.8
Mozambique	81.8
Sudan	60.1
Union of South Africa	18,947.0

[Source: *Economic Survey of Africa Since 1950*: UN, 1959]

These figures show that no less than 94 per cent of all the electric energy produced in Africa in 1957 was concentrated in four territories—the Republic (then Union) of South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Northern Rhodesia, and the Congo (formerly Belgian). The Union of South Africa alone accounted for about 74 per cent of the total output.

With the low economic level existing in Africa it is not surprising to find that her illiteracy rate often reaches 95 per cent, or that disease, ill-health and malnutrition are widespread.

The independent African states are beginning to battle against this terrible heritage of colonialism, but it must be remembered that most of them only became independent in 1960, and several even a year or two later. Therefore, one cannot say more than that the first steps (and sometimes not even that) are being taken to break the colonial pattern of the economy and lay the basis for rapid economic growth.

Under colonial rule Africa was converted into a huge plantation, turning out foodstuffs and industrial crops for Western consumption, and a rich mining base from which valuable ores were shipped to Western factories. The production of minerals and agricultural items was based on low wages for the workers and low pay for peasant producers. Where crops were produced on European plantations and farms, these, too, were based on low wages together with low prices for land. Thus a major aspect of Africa's colonial economy was the production of cheap raw materials for export. For her manufactured goods Africa was compelled to rely on imports from the industrialised Western powers—imports which were often manufactured from the very raw materials which Africa herself had exported.

Since the prices of Africa's raw materials exports tend to rise more slowly than the prices of her imported manufactured goods (and sometimes raw material prices even slump heavily), Africa loses millions a year through the unequal exchange, and the gap between Africa and the economically advanced countries becomes wider and wider. There are many examples which show that despite a considerable expansion in the *volume* of raw materials produced and exported, the fall in prices has resulted in African states obtaining practically no benefit from their greater production efforts.

Thus, when Uganda became independent in October 1962, it was revealed that over the previous eight years she had increased the *volume* of her domestic exports by 80 per cent, but the *value* of these exports had gone up by less than 5 per cent (*Guardian*: October 9, 1962). In 1960, according to United Nations FAO reports, the difference in value between Africa's exports of logs and imports of wood products amounted to a loss to Africa of about £43 million. This is just for one item, wood, so it can be easily imagined how much Africa loses each year through the unfavourable terms of trade if one were to take into account all the commodities exported and imported.

Figures recently released by the Nigerian Government are a

striking demonstration as to how Africa suffers from this warped division of labour in the world.

Nigeria is now the world's second largest cocoa producer, having recently overtaken Brazil. Yet she is now earning *less* from her cocoa exports than before, despite the huge increase in the actual volume exported. In 1954-1955, Nigeria exported under 84,000 tons of cocoa, for which she received £30 million. In 1961-1962, Nigeria exported 186,000 tons, which earned only £29 million. In other words, *Nigeria increased her export volume over this period by well over 120 per cent, yet her earnings dropped by over 3 per cent.* If 1961-1962 prices had been the same as 1954-1955, Nigeria would have earned from her cocoa exports in 1961-1962 as much as £70 million instead of £29 million. Thus, the fall in cocoa prices on the world market represented *a loss to Nigeria of no less than £41 million.*

But even this does not represent the whole picture, for while the prices of Nigeria's cocoa exports have been falling, the prices of the machines and manufactured goods which Nigeria imports from the imperialist countries have been rising. So that the £29 million which Nigerian cocoa exports earned in 1961-1962 represents, in terms of actual commodities which Nigeria can buy, considerably less than £29 million would have bought in 1954-1955.

It is therefore not surprising that Nigeria's Federal Prime Minister spoke bitterly at last year's Commonwealth Premiers' Conference of developing countries being 'caught in a vicious trap', as a result of the deteriorating terms of trade. He went on to point out that Nigeria's losses in this way exceeded the 'aid' she had received from the West.

The disastrous effects to Africa of the present warped division of labour between the imperialist countries and the economically developing countries are underlined by the incredible extent to which Africa has been made reliant on imports for even the most elementary of things. In a number of French-speaking territories in west and central Africa one can buy bottles of gum labelled 'Best Senegalese Gum. Made in France'. The raw material is transported all the way from Senegal to France, where it is processed and bottled—and then the bottled gum travels all the way back to Senegal for sale. In Liberia it is said that the new Ducor Palace Hotel in Monrovia was built entirely from imported materials (apart from some local stone). Even the nails had to be imported. Liberia's limited industrial development, it should be stressed, is by no means an exception in Africa.

* * *

As these examples show, industrial development in Africa has, in

most cases, hardly started. The net value of Africa's total industrial output is under £1,000 million—or less than that of Sweden. But even this is only part of the problem, for one-third of Africa's 'industrial' output is accounted for by mining, most of it to assist overseas industries; and another third is estimated as originating from small-scale handicrafts. Thus, manufacturing on modern lines, i.e. factory production, produces only about £350 million a year for the whole of Africa (excluding the Republic of South Africa). This is a total value equal to less than 5 per cent of the national income.

While Africa's modern manufacturing sector produces goods to the value of only £350 million a year, her imports of manufactured goods come to over £1,800 million; and for decades the major share of these imports has been of consumer goods, very often manufactured from the very raw materials which Africa exports. Import substitution by local manufacture is beginning to take place in the independent African states, notably in Ghana and Egypt. This is helping to save considerable amounts of foreign exchange which can be used to purchase machinery and other capital goods and thus assist industrialisation.

It is indicative of the changes taking place in Africa that machinery and equipment, which in 1950 accounted for only 3 per cent of African imports, reached 12 per cent by 1960; their volume increase in those ten years was seven-fold.

Africa spends enormous sums every year importing foodstuffs. Sierra Leone last year, for example, spent over £5 million—about 16 per cent of her total imports—on food. Ghana still has to spend a similar percentage. Obviously there can be no manufactured import substitution for food—yet, all the same, industrialisation can help enormously to solve this kind of problem. It has been estimated* that if grain to feed India's additional population over the next five years were imported, the cost would be about £350 million. If, instead, India were to import the necessary fertilisers to produce the needed additional grain, then the cost would only be £100 million. But this is only the beginning. If, instead of importing fertiliser, a new fertiliser factory were to be built *each year* in India, to produce 350,000 tons of ammonium sulphate, the foreign exchange cost would be reduced to only £40 million. And the foreign exchange costs of a heavy machine-building factory *to manufacture machinery to be installed in such a fertiliser plant every year would be about £8 million*. Thus, by an initial and single expenditure of £8 million,

* *Industrial Growth in Africa*: Report of UN Economic Committee for Africa, December 1962

India could save hundreds of millions of pounds otherwise spent on importing grain.

The same report contains similar calculations for mining machinery plant and heavy electrical equipment, resulting in vast savings. For £110 million, including £60 million of imported machinery, India could install a million-ton steel plant with an annual product value of £30 million. But if the £60 million were invested in a heavy machine-building factory, then, allowing for imports of about £40 million a year, it *could produce each year roughly £60 million worth of machinery or the equivalent of the imported machinery needed to set up a million-ton steel plant*. Once such a heavy machinery plant went into production, it would be possible *out of India's resources to start a new million-ton steel plant every year !*

The above examples demonstrate only too clearly the enormous advantages to be gained by industrialisation and the speed with which the whole economy can march forward if the basic heavy industry is there. It is therefore completely understandable that Guinea's economic plan should stress that industrialisation is the basis of her economic independence, and the surest way to progress 'because it is in that sector that the productivity of labour is highest. It is therefore industrialisation which will facilitate a rapid development of the country's wealth, without which the nation would be condemned to stagnation'.

* * *

Enough has been said to indicate that the key to Africa's economic growth is industrialisation—that is, the creation of a heavy industry capable of manufacturing the means of production. This means a modern engineering industry which can produce machines and machine tools, and with its basis in an iron and steel industry, supplies of fuel and power, chemicals and non-ferrous metals. It is a striking commentary on the nature of the imperialist exploitation of Africa that after sixty years of Western domination, the whole of Africa, apart from the white-dominated Republic of South Africa, has no such industrial base. (And even in the case of the Republic of South Africa industry serves the European minority, not the African majority.)

Yet without industrialisation Africa cannot solve her problems. Industrialisation means farm machinery, electric power, fertilisers and insecticides which are necessary for modernising agriculture. Industrialisation means machines for light industry, thus making possible an increased output of consumer goods. Industrialisation

means the creation of a skilled working class, an advance in education, technique and culture. Industrialisation leads the way to less heavy manual work and, by raising productivity, makes possible higher wages, better conditions and shorter hours. Industrialisation makes possible modern methods for building more schools and hospitals, and the rapid large-scale construction of housing. Industrialisation, by expanding the national income and the internal market, will stimulate the all-round growth of the economy. Industrialisation will enable Africa to catch up the economically more advanced countries, to end her dependence on imperialism for machinery and spare parts, and to strengthen her national defences. Thus, in every way, industrialisation will improve the lives of the African people and help them to uphold their newly-won independence.

As long as Africa remained under colonial rule, industrialisation was out of the question. In the plans of the imperialists, Africa was destined to be simply a raw materials appendage to Western industry. All the pre-independence 'Development Plans' of the colonial powers showed that this was their policy. For example, out of the £148 million allocated between 1946 and 1956 under the United Kingdom Colonial Development and Welfare Act, only £545,000—less than ½ per cent—was for industrial development. Of the £55 million granted in loans by the Colonial Development Corporation between 1948 and 1955, only 7 per cent went for 'factories'; the lion's share went to mining and agriculture.

France and Belgium followed precisely the same policy. Of the considerable sums allocated under the French FIDES Plan for French overseas territories, for the period 1949-1953, less than ½ per cent went for industrial development. In the estimates for the Ten Year Plan for the Congo, 1949-1959, industry does not appear at all!

Figures for particular regions or countries show the same general pattern. Nigeria's Development Plan for the period 1951-1956 allocated only 3.5 per cent of the total planned expenditure for industry. The 1955-1960 plan allocated only 1.3 per cent. Kenya's development programme for 1954-1957 did not even bother to mention industry at all.

* * *

While Africa lay under the heel of colonialism it was simple enough for the rulers to ensure that industrialisation did not take place. They held the state power, they controlled the economy, they laid down the laws, they decided the policies to be followed. But today they cannot operate in the same way. They no longer hold

state power over 200 million Africans. They no longer have undivided control of the economy. They are no longer in a position to lay down laws or to decide the policies of governments. Of course, they still have influence in many states but they no longer have the direct control of affairs in their own hands.

This has compelled the imperialists to lay down a heavy propaganda barrage during the past few years 'advising' Africans against industrialisation. Thus Kenneth Bradley, in a British Government publication *Britain's Purpose in Africa* (H.M.S.O. 1959), argued that the economy of Africa 'must always be based on peasant economy'. Mr. T. R. Batten (*The Problems of African Development*) asserts that 'most parts of Africa are quite unfitted for large-scale industrial production' and that consequently 'agriculture must always be the principal source of wealth'.

The International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, which has produced economic development surveys of a number of African territories, betrays a consistent anxiety that the independent African states may take it into their heads to build up their industry. Thus in its study of Tanganyika, published in 1961, it tends to decry basic industrialisation and to place the emphasis instead on agriculture. It argues that 'The scope of the domestic market is limited, and its expansion must depend primarily on the growth of agricultural incomes. There is neither the need for, nor the possibility of, rapid absorption of a large volume of unemployed or underemployed labour through industrial expansion' (p. 233).

Even when it comes to deal with the possible development in Tanganyika of local manufactures to replace present imports, it concentrates on such things as beer, cigarettes, sugar, textiles and cement and warns that 'Machinery and transport equipment, which comprise a fifth of total imports, must clearly be excluded'. When it comes to consider the question of expanding manufactures for export it can only think in terms of wattle extract, cashew nuts, lime juice, desiccated coconut, starch products and so forth. After all this, it is not surprising to find that in its final section, point 1 in its List of Recommendations is put as follows:

> 'The task of securing widespread income increase is to a major degree one of agricultural and livestock development' (p. 491).

It is sometimes quite incredible to see the extent to which the opponents of industrialising Africa push their arguments. In the report of one of the committees participating in the Convention on Social and Economic Development in the Emerging Kenya Nation,

August 12 to 17, 1962, one can find it solemnly argued that to offset the decline in the prices of Kenya's major exports, particularly coffee, 'the further expansion of tourism' should be considered as the alternative for earning foreign exchange and that therefore 'substantial capital should be devoted to this purpose' (*The Kenya We Want*).

After this it is not surprising to read in the election manifesto prepared by the Kenya Africa Democratic Union for the May 1963 elections:

> 'Kenya's greatest potential economic expansion lies in the attraction of tourists to our country.'

That KADU should be prepared to follow the anti-industrialisation policy of the imperialists will not come as any great surprise. What is more disturbing is that some of the major national parties in Africa tend to accept the advice of Western 'economic experts'.

* * *

In general, however, it can be said that political opinion in Africa is turning increasingly towards the idea of industrialisation. The recent report by the United Nations Economic Committee for Africa on *Industrial Growth in Africa* recognises this advance. The significant thing about this report is that it is predicated on the assumption that industrialisation is indispensable to economic growth. It points out that 'Rapid industrial expansion is . . . being accepted as the major means of economic growth of the under-developed countries' (p. 17).

This conclusion is based on the calculation that to bring Africa to the economic level of the industrialised countries, *the output of her agriculture would have to be doubled whereas that of her industry would have to be increased 25-fold.*

How long will this take? On the basis of a per capita annual increase in output of 1½ to 2 per cent for agriculture and 7 to 8 per cent for industry, the UN report estimates that the transformation of Africa from an industrially backward region to an economically advanced one would take about 50 years or possibly less. Another estimate, given in *The Development Decade* (a report prepared by the United Nations Economic and Social Committee), calculates that on the basis of a per capita rate growth for the whole of the economy of 5 per cent per year, Africa, to catch up the industrialised countries, would need 45 to 60 years. If Africa were to build her industry at the rate of that taken by the countries of Western Europe during

their century of industrialisation, it would take 100 years for Africa to reach present European levels.

The African people are certainly not going to let themselves be tied down to such slow 'Western type' time-tables as these. But if they are to advance more rapidly, then, in addition to making a number of radical political and social changes, they will have to abandon capitalist economic theories and draw on the experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries which have shown in practice that it is possible for an economically underdeveloped country to industrialise very rapidly. The Soviet Union commenced its First Five Year Plan in 1928. By 1937, after fulfilling two Five Year Plans, the generation of electric power had increased between seven and eight times, the output of iron and steel by four times, of coal by three and a half times, of oil by rather less than three times and of cement by three times. The building of the engineering industry went ahead still more rapidly. Between 1928 and 1940, the output of motor vehicles in the Soviet Union increased from 840 to 145,000, and of tractors from 1,300 to 31,600. China and other socialist countries have made similar phenomenal advances.

It was only after considerable discussion that the Soviet Union finally hammered out its policy of priority for heavy industry as the way forward to expand the whole economy, and the First Five Year Plan fully embodied this new principle. Hitherto, in world economist circles the theory of 'textiles first' (i.e. a slow path to industrialisation via light industry first and ending with heavy industry) held sway. The Soviet Union challenged this conception, first in theory and then in practice. Now all the socialist countries have demonstrated brilliantly in practice that a drive for basic industrialisation is the quickest way to advance the whole economy and to raise living standards.

Yet, as we have seen, bourgeois economists and advisers still work to persuade African leaders and governments away from industrialisation. Where they are driven to concede the necessity to industrialise they try to limit it to a question of the simple processing of local raw materials; and, even when they have to go beyond this, they strive to encourage the idea that the building of heavy industry can only be an ultimate aim, the culmination of a long effort to build up the economy in stages—first agriculture, then light industry, and finally heavy industry.

A valuable exposure of these theories has been made by Maurice Dobb in his recent study on *Economic Growth and Underdeveloped Countries* (Lawrence & Wishart, London, 1963: 3s. 6d.). Dobb

concentrates his argument around the key economic question facing the newly developing countries—how can they make *the most rapid* economic progress. He shows absolutely convincingly that the drive for basic industrialisation is the answer. The key problem is how is the economic surplus each year to be utilised so that it promotes rapid economic growth. In many new African states much of it is absorbed by various forms of excess consumption by the upper class, by hoarding at home and abroad, by flamboyant spending for personal ostentation, by the maintenance of unnecessarily large and unproductive bureaucracies which have been encouraged very often by the former colonial power in the final stages of its surrendering political control, and sometimes by expensive military establishments. There are also many untapped resources and forms of waste.

But the main thing which needs to be emphasised is that it is the way a newly developing country distributes investment between industries which make capital goods and industries which make consumer goods which will determine its rate of economic growth. And if sufficient investment is made in expanding capital goods, then, however small the usable surplus may be to begin with, its rate of growth (if the appropriate political and social organisation exists to mobilise and inspire human endeavour) will develop at a staggering rate. Dobb's arithmetical example is useful here. He points out that if we were to start with an investible fund growing at the rate of 2 per cent a year, at the end of 20 years it will have increased by 50 per cent, and after 100 years by only seven times. But if the growth rate can be stepped up to 10 per cent, then the initial amount available for investment will have increased two and a half times in a decade and by six or seven times in 20 years. By the end of a century it will be in the neighbourhood of several thousand times!

Thus, once an adequate rate-growth has been achieved by ploughing back the increment, there will soon be an ample margin to increase both consumption and investment at the same time.

In other words, by making strict economies and postponing non-essential consumption for a time, one very quickly reaches a position in which it is possible to start making huge strides forward in raising living standards. Capitalist theoreticians who are anxious to delay Africa's industrialisation pretend that the policy of giving priority to investment in heavy industry means one of forgoing consumer benefits until some long distant date in the future. In reality it is industrialisation which will enable the raising of standards to be made most rapidly.

No one would argue that the new African states should divert 100 per cent of their investment funds to expand the capital goods

sector. Part of the surplus, even in the earliest stages, must obviously go to expand consumer goods production in order to supply the needs of the growing army of workers. Social needs, such as housing, health facilities, better education and so on, must be met ; they are essential to help the workers increase productivity, for it is obvious that lack of training and skill, and debilitating illnesses—grim legacies of colonial rule—are a barrier to higher productivity. For the same reason there needs to be provision for higher wages and a system of social security. But for quite a foreseeable time ahead it will be necessary for priority to be given to capital goods production to the extent that it enables the given country to achieve a sufficiently high rate of growth to enable a rapid expansion of the total economy.

* * *

Of course, in explaining the need for industrialisation in one short article, it has not been possible to deal with a whole number of related problems. Consideration needs to be given to the various methods of accumulating capital within the country. Technicians and skilled workers have to be trained. Revolutionary changes need to be made in agriculture so as to enable a quick growth in that sector, too, and to enable the new scientific methods and farm machinery to be effectively utilised. The State sector of the economy should be built up and, at a certain stage, foreign monopolies nationalised. Economic planning is essential so that the concentration of funds and resources and effort can be made on the most important sectors of the economy. Control of foreign trade and a sound trade policy will make possible the best use of foreign exchange earnings. Economic relations of one-sided dependency on the imperialist powers must be ended. Relations of mutual economic benefit with the socialist countries hold many advantages for African states.

In particular, on the central question of industrialisation, there is a striking difference between the policy pursued by the socialist countries and that of the imperialist powers. Whereas the latter divert most of their funds in Africa to the production and export of raw materials, the socialist countries, to the extent of their practical possibilities, are ready to build whole factories which, when completed, belong entirely to the new African states. This is of considerable help in assisting Africa to overcome her colonial economy and to become industrialised.

There is one final point about industrialisation in Africa which needs to be emphasised. Here, in this article, we have been mainly

concerned to explain the reasons for Africa's economic backwardness and the poverty of her people, and to point to the path of industrialisation as the way forward. At the moment there are 32 sovereign African states; before long there will be over 50. Obviously, if each of the 50 or so independent African states, some of them populated by only a few hundred thousand people, were to embark separately on its own path of industrialisation the task would be immense. Economic co-ordination, regional development, all-African planning —this is the surest way to a rapid advance of Africa's economy. To take Africa's water-power resources as one example, these naturally fall into several key regions which could be the basis for an electric grid system, first regional and then linked up in an all-African grid. The alternative of building simultaneously over 50 hydro-electric projects, one for each state, would be economic madness. Similarly, the concentration of minerals in certain regions (copper in the Congo and Northern Rhodesia, iron ore in Liberia, Guinea, Gabon, Mauretania and other west African states, bauxite in Guinea, Ghana, the Cameroons, etc.), the suitability for some regions for livestock development, others for growing cotton and developing a textile industry—all this underlines the importance of hastening the drive to all-African unity.

As long as different African states remain within the sphere of different imperialist economies, so long will the possibilities of all-African economic planning and development be hampered. The uprooting of imperialism in Africa is therefore essential for strengthening African unity and making possible Africa's industrialisation and speedy economic progress. And this process will be hastened if the Republic of South Africa, the continent's most industrialised state, is restored to the African people, so that it can give powerful assistance to the industrialisation of the whole continent.

BRITAIN AND SOUTH AFRICA

by **JOHN GOLLAN**

(General Secretary, Communist Party of Great Britain)

Following a request by the editorial board of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST *for the views of the Communist Party of Great Britain concerning Britain's relations with the Republic of South Africa and with the High Commission Territories, the following statement of policy of the Communist Party of Great Britain has been made by its General Secretary, John Gollan.*

THE SITUATION IN South Africa is rapidly reaching crisis point. The hated Verwoerd Government is piling repression on repression, determined to shut down every possibility of protest or criticism of the monstrous system of apartheid, and every demand of the people for democratic rights and for an end to the nightmare of racial discrimination and fascist tyranny. The only answer to this terror will be the justified revolt of the people of South Africa.

The recent historic conference of African heads of state at Addis Ababa shows that Africa is no longer prepared to tolerate the foul blot of apartheid on its soil. The 218 million people of independent Africa and the 48 million still under European domination have spoken—and now they are preparing to act.

It is time for the British people to act, too.

The people of Britain have a deep hatred for the whole rotten system of apartheid, a feeling that was sharply manifested at the time of the Sharpeville massacre three years ago, and has since been expressed in the many resolutions of protest adopted by numerous progressive organisations in Britain, by the consumer boycott, by numerous meetings and demonstrations, and by the campaign now developing to stop the shipment of arms to Verwoerd.

* * *

But the struggle of the British people, in solidarity with the people of South Africa, needs to be greatly stepped up.

Without the aid of British imperialism it would be difficult for the Verwoerd Government to carry on—and there is a growing awareness of this in Britain. Increasing indignation is being expressed in Britain over the British Tory Government's consistent support for the South African Government at U.N.O. In words the Tory ministers profess to abhor apartheid—but when it comes to action, they always have a ready excuse not to support any proposal at the United Nations which means bringing real pressure to bear on the Verwoerd Government.

Economically, too, British imperialism is assisting Verwoerd. The £1,000 million of British capital invested in South Africa is an investment in apartheid. The profits which British monopolies make from these investments are based on the agony, sweat and low wages of the African workers. Though forced to leave the Commonwealth, the Republic of South Africa still benefits from Commonwealth trade advantages with Britain.

The Tories and British big business, to protect their own economic interests, are helping to maintain Verwoerd in power by providing him with the necessary military equipment to repress the people, and to turn the Republic of South Africa into an armed camp. Defence expenditure in South Africa is now running at about £70 million a year—treble the amount of 1959. Every young European is now receiving military training, and even young girls are being trained to shoot.

Not content with supplying the Saracen armoured cars which were used in the Sharpeville massacre, British firms, with the agreement of the British Government, are providing Buccaneer Mk. 2 aircraft, Canberra Mk. 12s, and Westland Wasp military helicopters. A subsidiary of the I.C.I. is helping to construct three arms factories in South Africa. Other equipment is being sent under the terms of the Simonstown Agreement.

The Tory party and the monopolies they represent are not limiting their effort to supporting Verwoerd. Their most reactionary sections are helping the creation of a 'white axis' in southern Africa—a last-ditch stand of the four million settlers in South Africa, Southern Rhodesia, Mozambique and Angola, under Verwoerd, Salazar and Welensky. Thus the maintenance of the Verwoerd regime in South Africa, and its arms build-up with the aid of British imperialism, is not just a menace to the people of South Africa. It is a threat to all Africa still under the heel of colonialism—and a threat, too, to the 218 million Africans of the independent states who have pledged themselves to help liberate their oppressed brothers.

Thus British imperialism is conniving at creating a situation in Southern Africa which can rapidly produce a major threat to peace.

* * *

A special danger confronts the three High Commission Territories —Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland. By denying them independence, the British Government is helping Verwoerd, who fears that as outposts of independence on the doorstep of the Republic of South Africa, the Territories would inspire the people of South Africa to even greater efforts in their fight for freedom.

The recent brutal suppression, by the British Government, of the strikes of Swaziland asbestos miners and sugar workers, backed by other sections of the Swaziland people, shows that British imperialism is the bitter enemy of the African people, and can never be relied on to defend Swaziland against the Verwoerd Government. The troops used for this repressive action were flown from the British military base in Kenya, making use of Southern Rhodesia's airplane landing facilities, and with the agreement of the Verwoerd Government to fly over South African territory.

The British Government is also collaborating with the South African authorities in making difficulties for those political refugees from South Africa who are endeavouring to carry on political activities in the High Commission Territories on behalf of their brothers in the Republic. As in the case of Ganyile, and more recently over the Leballo affair, it is clear that the South African police are being given every assistance by the police in Basutoland to persecute political refugees from the hell of South Africa. This is the same disgraceful policy as that being pursued by the Federal Government in Northern and Southern Rhodesia where attempts have been made, in some cases successfully, to deport political refugees back to South Africa.

All collusion between the British authorities in Basutoland, Bechuanaland and Swaziland, and the Verwoerd Government and police must be ended. Political refugees in these three territories should be granted their normal rights to conduct political activity on behalf of their oppressed brothers in the Republic of South Africa.

We further believe that these three Territories should be granted immediate independence and allowed at the same time to take their place, as sovereign states, in the United Nations. Once independent, these Territories, in association with the 32 independent African states, would be able to take the necessary measures to defend them-

selves against aggression from Verwoerd. The states and peoples of the African continent, who are taking serious measures to help liberate their brothers in the Republic of South Africa, are not likely to stand by and allow Verwoerd to extend his hated apartheid domain to new territories. A firm statement from the British Government that it would oppose a Verwoerd take-over would also play its part in deterring such aggression.

* * *

The pledge of the Labour leader, Mr. Harold Wilson, that a Labour Government would not supply arms to support apartheid in South Africa has been warmly welcomed by the British people. But the matter is too urgent to await an electoral victory. The campaign for 'No British arms for South Africa' must be waged NOW, against the present Tory Government.

Furthermore, the Simonstown Agreement of 1955 must not become the excuse to ship arms to Verwoerd under another guise. This agreement is supported in some quarters as assisting 'the defence of the free world'. When the 'free world' includes such an abomination as the present South African Government based on a foul creed of racial discrimination, slave labour and fascist thought-control, it is clear that the less we have to do with it the better. In any case, the terms of the Simonstown Agreement make it clear that the so-called 'defence of South Africa' for which the agreement was drawn up includes 'Southern Africa, Africa and the Middle East gateways to Africa'. In other words, the Simonstown base is an aggressive base, a base for the protection of imperialist interests throughout Africa and the Middle East, and is thus a threat to the efforts of the peoples throughout these regions to win their complete independence from imperialist exploitation. We can never be a party to supporting the Simonstown Agreement, nor agree to the sending of arms to South Africa on the basis of fulfilling such an agreement.

Similarly, we cannot accept the argument of those who claim that arms sent to Verwoerd under the Simonstown Agreement are for *external* use and not for use against the people of South Africa. The arms are easily adaptable for either use ; and moreover, the present government of South Africa is such an obvious menace to the peoples of Africa as a whole that any arms sent to it are arms for aggression against the African people.

There are those who would argue that we need these arms contracts in order to maintain workers in Britain in employment. The Tories had no compunction about stopping the shipment of arms to

Cuba once the dictator Batista had been overthrown. And there have been other states to which the Tories have stopped sending arms. In any case, the British engineering industry would find far bigger orders in producing machinery, tractors, merchant ships, civil aircraft and other useful goods for independent Africa than it ever could in continuing its squalid arms deal to maintain the system of apartheid.

* * *

Our Party, which ever since its birth has consistently fought against the oppression of the African peoples, and which at its recent 28th Congress adopted a special Emergency Resolution in solidarity with the struggling people of South Africa, will do everything possible to arouse the people of Britain to redouble their efforts in support of the call for 'No British arms for South Africa'. We will give full support to the efforts of the Anti-Apartheid organisation, the Movement for Colonial Freedom and all other bodies campaigning for this aim and against colonialism and racial discrimination.

In this grave hour, when South Africa is rapidly becoming a threat to the whole of southern Africa and a base for imperialist aggression against the peaceloving African peoples, we declare our utmost solidarity with the peoples of South Africa, Basutoland, Swaziland and Bechuanaland, who are so valiantly struggling to break the chains of bondage and oppression and join their 218 million brothers in independent Africa.

We will do all in our power to respond to the needs of the situation in the realisation that a victory over Verwoerd in South Africa and for the independence of the High Commission Territories would be a powerful blow against British imperialism and an important victory in the common struggle of the British and African peoples for peace, friendship, economic co-operation and social advance.

SOME SECRETS OF THE CONGO

Charles Howard Snr

This article is reproduced—with slight abbreviation—from Freedomways, *a quarterly review of the Negro freedom movement in the United States published at 799 Broadway, New York 3.*

While we are sure our readers will be interested in this fascinating glimpse of what went on behind the scenes in the Congo, we should perhaps point out that we do not necessarily share the views of Mr. Howard, nor he ours.

IT TOOK A GREAT deal of ingenuity, effort, ill-will, hatred and downright double dealing to foster the murder, poverty, chaos, and destruction which have been the Congo's trademarks since independence day, June 30, 1960.

Such a disaster could not have been accidental. It could not have been the result of benevolent mismanagement. It had to be deliberate. Ignorance, lack of preparation, none of these singly or collectively could have produced the havoc. It took evil genius to get the job done. Some time this evil genius paraded under the title 'cold war'. Above all is the startling role played by two American Negroes.

The disruption of the independence of the Congo (Leopoldville) did not occur without a specific plan. Nor was it without a specific goal. Neither was it played out without specific actors.

The specific goal is to forever prevent the creation of a strong, wealthy, black-led Africa. To keep the wealth of the Congo out of black hands. To keep colonialism present in Africa forever, or certainly as long as it is possible. The plan is to keep it divided into small, ineffective, pauperized fragments, in other words Balkanize it. To destroy its effective leadership.

The actors are the representatives of those industrial and financial giants of Britain, France, Belgium, South Africa and the United States, who stand to benefit by Africa being pauperized, Balkanized and divided.

Let us go back and check the record. Certainly there was no lack of former experience. Nine African countries and twelve Asian countries had been brought to independence before the Congo. The African countries were Cameroun, Ghana, Guinea, Libya, Malagasy Republic, Morocco, Sudan, Togo, and Tunisia. They all reached independence with more or less peaceful transitions. Why not the Congo? Has nothing been learned in all this time? Was there not a sea of knowledge with which to dampen the hell-fires which flared up in the Congo? Or did someone actually feed the flames?

Since the independence of the Congo, eleven states have been carved out of the former French West Africa and French Equatorial Africa. Somalia, Sierra Leone, Tanganyika and Nigeria have reached their independence later. Liberia, Ethiopia and Egypt (U.A.R.) are older independent states. South Africa is not included in the present calculation since it presents another phase of the problem.

Thus, with all the experience available, and in these days of modern political techniques, it would seem utterly unnecessary to have the disruptions that have confronted the Congolese leaders in bringing their country to stability, a stability not yet attained.

What was so different about the Congolese people, as compared with the people of other countries in Africa, that made their transition to independence so loaded with difficulties? One could say the answer is a resounding '*Nothing*.' However, we cannot overlook the failure of Belgium, who, having the responsibility for so long, was terribly remiss in its obligation to train the Congolese people for what everyone knew would be their eventual independence.

The cause of the disruption, in part, lies in the determination of certain forces not to have successful African Governments anywhere in Africa, but certainly not in a country so large, so wealthy in natural resources and so strategically located as the Congo.

Experience has taught that there are at least two main sources of disruption in bringing an African country to independence. First, the existence of natural resources in the country, particularly mineral wealth. Second, a proportionately large white population.

There is fabulous mineral wealth in this former Belgian colony. But it is not only the mineral wealth within the country itself, but also its proximity to similar mineral wealth in areas still under colonial control. In the Congo, it is a case of its proximity especially to Northern Rhodesia and Angola, as well as its general area relationship to Mozambique, South West Africa and South Africa.

A survey (1957) of the mineral deposits of these countries discloses the following:

Congo: Three-fourths of the world's industrial diamonds. Copper is the country's most important mineral. Other minerals include gold, tin, zinc, silver and many of the elements used in creating atomic weapons, including bauxite.

Angola: Diamonds, copper, iron, phosphates and oil.

Mozambique: Gold, iron, coal, graphite, copper and bauxite.

Northern Rhodesia: Copper, zinc, lead and cobalt. The survey reports tremendous increases in the production of all minerals.

South West Africa: Diamonds (gem and industrial), copper, lead, zinc and manganese.

South Africa: Gold, diamonds (world's leading producer of gem diamonds), copper, lead, zinc, uranium, wide range of priceless stones, coal, iron, and all the material needed for alloying steel as well as platinum metals.

These mineral deposits found in common in these states and the necessity for their development and control creates certain political overtones occasioned by the organizations of capital for their extraction, processing and marketing. This results in the development of certain kinds of industrial and financial giants. Among these giants exercising control are Union Miniere du Haut-Katanga, Ltd., Committee Special du Katanga, Society General de Belgique, and Tanganyika Concessions, Ltd. The control of these organizations is mainly in the hands of Belgian, British, French, South African, and United States industrial and financial interests, and those interests demonstrate their strength on occasions in their behind-the-scenes operations.

These interests exercise their influence on the political activities both of their respective governments and the United Nations. Also, with their unlimited financial resources, in the process they organize agencies to influence public opinion. One of these agencies created here in the United States to influence public opinion is a group called 'American Committee For Aid To Katanga Freedom Fighters'. The aim of this particular operation is to undermine United States governmental support of the United Nations operations in the Congo. Their basic and long-term goal is to prevent the unification and peaceful transition of an African country, the Congo, to independence.

With typical 'Madison Avenue techniques' they capitalize on the current 'Negro Freedom Struggle' and amazingly enough, though the ultimate result will be the Balkanization and destruction of an African country, the 'Committee' has a Negro chairman, Max Yergan.

The 'Committee' brings together a combination of individuals who have been outstanding in their individual records for opposition to American Negro and African freedom and progress. The list includes Senator James O. Eastland (D. Miss.), Senator J. Strom Thurmond (D. S. Car.), Senator Richard Russell (D. Ga.), Senator Thomas J. Dodd (D. Conn.), Max Yergan and George S. Schuyler. Yergan and Schuyler are Negroes.

It is worth while to review the record of these men in matters affecting the American Negro and the African. 'Eastland of Mississippi' is almost a curse word on the lips of American Negroes. He comes from a state that is outstanding for its opposition to social progress for Negroes, or any extension of civil rights to its Negro citizens. To date (1962) not a single public school has been desegregated in Mississippi, although the United States Supreme Court decision outlawing segregation in public facilities was handed down in 1954. In 1944 and since, Eastland has filibustered against all anti-poll tax bills in the Senate. In 1948, he broke with the Democratic Party and joined the Dixiecrat Party because of the 'civil rights planks' in the Democratic Party platform. The State of Mississippi has been the most cruel state of all in its persecution of 'freedom fighters'. It is openly admitted that the leadership for Mississippi's adamancy against 'Negro rights' stems from Senator Eastland.

Senator Strom Thurmond of South Carolina was the leader of the Dixiecrat movement in the South and was the candidate for the Presidency of the United States on the Dixiecrat Party ticket in 1948. Here are some of the principles stated in the Dixiecrat Party platform which Strom Thurmond embraced and enunciated:

'We stand for the segregation of the races and the racial integrity of each race . . . We oppose the elimination of segregation, the repeal of miscegenation statutes, the control of private employment by federal bureaucrats called for by the misnamed civil rights program. We favor home rule, local self-government and a minimum interference with individual rights.

'We oppose and condemn the action of the Democratic Convention in sponsoring a civil rights program calling for the elimination of segregation, social equality by federal fiat, regulation of private employment practices, voting and local law enforcement.

'We affirm that the effective enforcement of such a program would be utterly destructive of the social, economic and political life of the Southern People, and of other localities in which there may be differences of race, creed or national origin in appreciable numbers.'

In 1957 Senator Strom Thurmond filibustered in the United States

Senate against pending civil rights legislation for twenty-four hours and eighteen minutes. The filibuster record.

Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, in several sessions of Congress, has masterminded practically all of the opposition to efforts designed to weaken the filibuster hold on Senate procedures held by southern and northern Negro-haters in the Senate. He has been a relentless foe of all civil rights bills in the Senate. His opposition to Supreme Court decisions favoring desegregation in schools and public transportation cases is legend. It is common knowledge in high political circles that his strong anti-Negro sentiments have kept him from consideration for higher posts in the government.

Senator Dodd, of Connecticut, is known in big money circles as a representative of Anaconda Copper. For some time it has been reported that Anaconda Copper and a South American copper combine are uniting to take over Union Miniere du Haut-Katanga. It is also reported that that was his mission in Katanga in the fall of 1961. Actually, the Senator was being entertained in Elizabethville on November 28, 1961, when Katangese para-commandos broke into his party and beat up two United Nations officials, Brian Urquhart and George Ivan Smith. One must question the attitude of the Senator towards the brutal beating given these two United Nations servants judging from his reported statements. First, he was reported as about to review his former glowing commendatory remarks about the peaceful, law-abiding administration of his 'boy' Tshombe. Realizing that such an about-face might play havoc with his 'mission', he swallowed again and stuck to his thesis: 'Tshombe was running a most peaceful and successful administration in Katanga. Really the only peaceful and business-like operation in all the Congo and he really deserves our support.'

Max Yergan has been described, by the Congo Information Officer of the Central Government at the United Nations, as 'a man who sees a communist behind every bush'. Yergan is a bitter critic of United States support of the United Nations, which support he describes as 'anxiety to outbid every communist show of anti-colonial zeal'.

He criticized the United States for the support of a resolution passed by the United Nations General Assembly which 'urged that immediate steps be taken to grant full independence to all African colonial areas without any condition or reservations in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire, without any distinction as to race, creed, or color, in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom'. Yergan was opposed to that resolution,

which was approved by a vote of eighty-nine in favor, none against, and nine abstentions. Australia, Belgium, Dominican Republic, France, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, and the United Kingdom abstained.

The United States in a later action after the matter was passed by that overwhelming vote, 'urged Portugal to conform to the United Nations Resolution'.

Yergan is said to be the head of a private research organization called Africa Consultants. He reports that he visited Angola twice in 1961. These trips were undoubtedly made as the head of Africa Consultants, and at the expense of the Portuguese Government.

Yergan has repeatedly written and made statements in support of the policies of the South African Government as they affect the cruelly treated indigenous people of the Republic of South Africa.

Yergan in criticizing United States policy on African questions says: 'Washington cannot even pretend that it has put principle above expediency, its actions have been too transparently bids for Afro-Asian popularity.' Obviously Yergan is opposed to United States support for African independence, except on Yergan's terms, which must be Salazar's terms and Prime Minister Verwoerd's terms. He adheres strictly to the Portuguese and South African lines. Africans could hardly find less hope for their future than is set up by these bitter enemies of African independence.

George Schuyler is head of the China Lobby in the United States. He too is a bitter critic of United States policy in African matters. He too was in Angola in 1961. He has written and made radio speeches where he said: 'Intelligent Africans see through American support of terrorists as a cheap and fraudulent action.' Undoubtedly some Africans, to serve their own selfish purposes, may have said as much, but certainly that is not the opinion of intelligent and accepted African leadership.

Schuyler is hardly less vicious in his attacks on United States support of African independence than is Yergan. He is also a bitter critic of American Negro youth 'freedom fighters'. How the term 'freedom fighters' ever found its way into the name of the Eastland, Thurmond, Russell, Dodd, Yergan, Schuyler supported Committee to help Tshombe is difficult to figure out. Certainly none of them, according to their records, could possibly care less about freedom for Africans or American Negroes.

The second source of disruption in bringing an African country to independence is the presence within their country of a substantial European (white) population. Algeria, the Republic of South Africa,

and Southern Rhodesia are excellent illustrations. It is, of course, not the presence of the white population alone that poses the problem but the fact that the white population is always able to enlist the military support needed from their ancestral lands.

The white man will not live with any non-white man any place on a basis of equality, be it Africa, Asia or the United States, until he is compelled to do so. The white man, in entirely too many instances, has never given up the idea that he is God and therefore is entitled to preference. The African is determined that in his own land, *his home*, he is going to be equal of every other man there. The white man is making a determined last stand not to permit him to do so. These two seemingly irresistible forces may yet bring the world to a cataclysmic end. It does not yet appear that it will not do so.

It is interesting to note the role being enacted by the governments of those financial interests most heavily involved industrially and financially in the Congo, and in the 'stop Africa independence movement'. The role of each government has been apparently independent, but certainly they were interlocking and complementary.

The role of the Government of the United Kingdom in backing Tshombe is completely denied verbally by the United Kingdom government, but their actions speak louder than their words. While voting for resolutions supporting the unity of the Congo and making speeches in that direction, under pressure from their extreme right wing, the British government withdrew their promise to furnish bombs for the jets being manned by the Indians, which were sorely needed to counter Tshombe's jets, and they refused the Ethiopian jet planes on their way to help the hard-pressed United Nations forces in Katanga, the right to refuel in Uganda. These two moves alone could have been fatal to the United Nations cause in the Congo.

Another role of the British right wing was obviously to exert pressure on Hammarskjold, apparently designed to halt the implementation of a United Nations resolution which they opposed.

Informed circles at the U.N. have known for a long time that there was a force in the United Nations more powerful than the Security Council or the General Assembly. The implementation of important resolutions often failed if certain big powers did not wish them carried out, in spite of the fact that they had received the required majorities.

An illustration of this British pressure was the visit of Lord Lansdowne to the Congo shortly before the death of Hammarskjold. Under the guise of an inspection trip, the visit was obviously made

in order to put pressure on Hammarskjold to halt United Nations military action in Katanga. When it was desirable to put pressure on the Secretary-General, all that was necessary was for Lord Lansdowne at the right moment to inquire of Hammarskjold, 'How many Permanent Members of the Security Council he thought he could afford to offend.' The Russians were already boycotting him and another Security Council member against him might prove fatal. This is the same Lord Lansdowne who 'insisted' on Hammarskjold journeying to Ndola to meet and negotiate with Tshombe. A trip never completed, for it was on this trip that Hammarskjold lost his life.

The United Kingdom Government bears the responsibility for the foreign affairs of the Central African Federation, of which Northern Rhodesia is a part. The Prime Minister of the Federation, Sir Roy Welensky, has been involved in actions which on the surface at least seem to lend credence to reports that his government was rendering assistance to the Katanga government. Mr. Welensky's government has been adamant in its refusal to permit United Nations representatives to enter Northern Rhodesia and inspect check points along the Northern Rhodesia-Congolese border, to prevent the further flow of arms and ammunition into Katanga for the support of Tshombe. This action, of course, raises the question as to the reliability of British claims that it supports U.N. actions in the Congo operation.

France's role in opposition to the Congo operation is, of course, consistent with her persistent position against having almost anything to do with the Congo affair. Except for a few votes in the Security Council of the United Nations in the early days of the Congo operation, France has abstained. This has been especially so when any specific action to help unify the Congo was under consideration. French-made fighter planes have found their way into the Katanga 'air force'.

France prior to 1960 administered her two largest areas on the African continent, French Equatorial Africa and French West Africa, as French 'overseas' territories. When pressure for independence became irresistible, instead of creating two large viable states in Africa as she had administered them, they were split up and Balkanized into eleven non-viable states called the French Community. France retained responsibility for foreign affairs and defense. Once Balkanized these areas became potential pawns in French foreign policy.

Admittedly, the military leadership of Tshombe's mercenaries

has been and continues to be French. At one point recruiting for Tshombe's mercenaries was openly carried on in France.

The role of Belgium, of course, has been that of a party in interest. Belgium has been constantly at odds with the United Nations in the matter of getting mercenaries out of the Congo. Belgian nationals have returned to the Congo since their first exodus after independence. Belgium's most effective role has been in the industrial and financial fields. Union Miniere, though internationally owned, has been Belgian operated.

Belgium's early role in preventing the success of a Government in the Congo that it did not like and Belgium's role in co-operation with the United States in ousting the Lumumba Government and substituting the Mobutu-Kasavubu military regime, is one of the neatest undercover operations ever inflicted upon a disadvantaged people. This was done primarily by financial manœuvres. The National Bank of Belgium by the simple move of refusing the right of its subsidiary, the Central Bank of the Congo, to loan any money to the Congo Government without the prior consent of the National Bank of Belgium, kept the Lumumba Government from functioning or being able to pay its army and thus maintain security. Belgium kept this up long enough for Mobutu to be installed, whom the business interests financed, so he could take over the Congolese Army and oust Lumumba. The ousting of Lumumba was an absolute necessity if the Congo was going to be kept out of African hands. Not only must he be ousted but he must be got out of the way. For so long as he remained on the political scene he remained a threat to white domination of the Congo and the rest of Africa.

In discussing the role of the United States in the Congo one must distinguish between the roles played by the Eisenhower Administration and the role played by the Kennedy Administration. Because there is a distinct difference. The Eisenhower program was a 'cold war' operation and carried out for the benefit of the co-operating business interests with no concern for the interests of the Congolese people. The West early developed a distaste for Lumumba and decided that he was not going to remain Prime Minister irrespective of the mandate of the Congolese elections or the wishes of the Congolese people.

The functional operation was carried out by Ambassador Timberlake. With the United Kingdom, Belgian and French support a wedge was driven between Kasavubu and Lumumba and there has never been a moment's peace in the Congo since. According to Andrew Tully, who wrote *C.I.A.* (1962), Kasavubu was advised by

the Central Intelligence Agency 'that he had the right to remove Lumumba and dissolve the government'. According to the 'loi Fondemantle' Kasavubu did not have such power without the consent of Parliament, but the West was in a position to make his decisions stick. And they did. Kasavubu, whom Tully wrote 'sat at the feet of the C.I.A.', announced the removal of Lumumba as Prime Minister. The C.I.A. created Kasavubu and Mobutu in the image they wished and they have remained so. Quoting Tully further, 'Mobutu, a one-time stringer for Agence France Press in Leopoldville and a former sergeant in the Force Publique under the Belgians, it seems safe to say was "discovered" by the C.I.A.' It was common knowledge among informed sources in the Congo that during the month of August 1960 Mobutu was a constant night-time visitor at the United States Embassy in Leopoldville. Shortly afterwards he turned up with enough money to undermine the Lumumba Government; being able to pay the army and take over.

In spite of the fact that a Parliament has been reconvened and a government has been set up, the C.I.A. control of the situation through 'their men', Kasavubu and Mobutu, has never been broken. Typical of divide-and-rule technique, however, these two have never been permitted to get too close together. When the Kasavubu-Bomboko-Ileo group arrested Tshombe and brought him to Leopoldville, it was Mobutu who released him.

Quoting Tully further, referring to conditions after the reconvening of Parliament and the creation of the Adoula Government, 'when unity appeared, British and European mining interests stepped in behind the scenes in Katanga and encouraged Tshombe to resist United Nations efforts to bring Katanga back into the fold. The shameless and bloody period which followed, climaxed in the death of Hammarskjold in a suspicious plane crash while a new wave of bitterness swept the Congo'.

Undoubtedly the most significant role played by the C.I.A. was the break-up of the conciliation between Kasavubu and Lumumba. During October 1960, a conciliation agreement was worked out between Kasavubu and Lumumba by a Conciliation Commission appointed by the Parliament and ably assisted by a United Nations representative. Lumumba showed me one of the original signed copies of the agreement and gave me a copy of it, which I still have in my possession. Mr. Okito, President of the Senate, who was later murdered with Lumumba, and who was also a member of the Conciliation Commission, verified the signature of Kasavubu and others, including his own, on the agreement.

On the day the agreement was signed and witnessed, it was agreed that Kasavubu and Lumumba would go on the radio and together announce their reconciliation to all the Congo. Cars were standing in front of their respective residences ready to take them to the radio station, when Kasavubu received a telephone call. After that telephone call Kasavubu refused to go along to the radio station to make the announcement.

Sources in the Congo, in a position to know, say that Ambassador Scott of the United Kingdom, Ambassador Timberlake of the United States, Mr. Linner of the United Nations, and Colonel (now General) Mobutu were together at the time that that telephone call came to Kasavubu. It is a known fact that the United Nations representative who assisted in negotiating that conciliation was a few days afterward shipped off to Kivu Province. Undoubtedly, that telephone call was the most devastating telephone call ever put through on an African telephone. That decision may have led eventually to the death of Mr. Hammarskjold.

It seems reasonable to deduct from subsequent actions that the Kennedy Administration has embarked upon a different foreign policy than the one in existence under Eisenhower. Ambassador Timberlake has been removed and United States policy seems dedicated to the creation of a United Congo. But, it should be remembered that business men call the tune in the Congo, not politicians. Actually, on occasion business men use the political machinery to carry out policies quite contrary to announced political goals. Such is the reality of the 'cold war' which has torn the Congo wide open and keeps it so.

The Congo situation cannot be considered in isolation. While for the moment the Congo is the focal point of most attention, Northern Rhodesia and other parts of the Central African Federation are rapidly forging their way into the spotlight. The problem there is the same—mineral wealth and the determination of certain forces to see that this wealth does not come under the control of Africans.

The efforts to divide Katanga from the rest of the Congo have a two-fold purpose. First, to salvage the mineral wealth of Katanga, Northern and Southern Rhodesia, and South West Africa for the colonial powers, and second, to halt the forward progress of African nationalism.

The events mentioned here are but a few skeins in the web that has entangled contemporary Africa as the people and leaders on that continent continue the struggle to free all of Africa from the last vestiges of colonialism.

All of Africa must be released from any form of colonialism. What has been said here, however, should provide some insight into the last desperate struggle being made by those who hate to see the old order change. Nevertheless, the forces of history cannot be checked, and though it may take more time in some places than was anticipated, Africa will be free.

WHERE OUR RICHES GO

'Our continent is probably the richest in the world for minerals and industrial and agricultural primary materials. From the Congo alone, Western firms exported copper, rubber, cotton, and other goods to the value of 2,773 billion dollars in the ten years between 1945 and 1955, and from South Africa, Western gold mining companies have drawn a profit, in the six years between 1947 and 1951, of 814 billion dollars.

'Our continent certainly exceeds all the others in potential hydroelectric power, which some experts assess as 42 per cent of the world's total. What need is there for us to remain hewers of wood and drawers of water for the industrialised areas of the world?

'It is said, of course, that we have no capital, no industrial skill, no communications and no internal markets, and that we cannot even agree among ourselves how best to utilise our resources.

'Yet all the stock exchanges in the world are preoccupied with Africa's gold, diamonds, uranium, platinum, copper and iron ores. Our capital flows out in streams to irrigate the whole system of Western economy. Fifty-two per cent of the gold in Fort Knox at this moment, where the U.S.A. stores its bullion, is believed to have originated from our shores. Africa provides more than 60 per cent of the world's gold. A great deal of the uranium for nuclear power, of copper for electronics, of titanium for supersonic projectiles, of iron and steel for heavy industries, of other minerals and raw materials for lighter industries—the basic economic might of the foreign powers—come from our continent.'

—Dr. Kwame Nkrumah—President of Ghana.
In his address to the Conference of Heads of
African States, Addis Ababa, May 24th, 1963.

MARXIST-LENINIST STUDY

A Note on Mr. MBOYA'S 'SOCIALISM'

by
Terence Africanus

'We will not allow ourselves to be caught by the magic of words. Most of the States speak of African socialism. Even Senghor speaks of African socialism.
'If we are not careful the word "socialism" will be emptied of its meaning, and bourgeois systems of the most reactionary kind will be able to camouflage themselves under the sign of socialism.'

—President Modibo Keita, of Mali

SOCIALISM HAS TREMENDOUS popular appeal in Africa today. There are a number of important reasons for this, among which we may mention the following:

1. Socialism is the direct opposite and leading opponent of imperialism and its offspring, colonialism, against which we of Africa have been fighting and are still fighting today as our bitterest enemy. It was the great October Socialist revolution in Russia which struck the first shattering blow against imperialism in 1917, which opened the road to all the glorious victories of the Asian, African and Latin American peoples, which are still continuing and will go on until the last vestiges of colonialism have been destroyed. And it is still today the countries of the socialist camp which are the staunchest friends and supporters of the colonial and formerly colonial peoples in their hard struggle to complete their independence and overcome the terrible consequences of foreign rule.
2. Africans have seen and suffered from capitalism at work in their midst, with its ruthless exploitation of human labour, its criminal

disregard of the welfare, lives, health and interests of the people. We have not fought and sacrificed for freedom, merely in order to exchange black exploiters for white ones.

3. The great immediate need of all the African peoples, and especially the young independent states, is to overcome the technological, industrial and economic backwardness which imperialism has left us with—so that we may hold on to and strengthen our independence; so that we may raise our people's standards of living, health, education and happiness. We must catch up—rapidly, with giant's strides—with the advanced nations of the world. For centuries Africa has been the prey of alien conquerors, seeking and grabbing our natural and human resources —because we were backward. Conquest and colonialism have kept us backward. We must seize the chance to overcome that backwardness now, or our children will curse us for allowing them once again to be enslaved. And we can see with our own eyes, from the experience of the U.S.S.R., People's China, Vietnam, Korea and the socialist lands of East and Central Europe, that *only* socialism enables undeveloped economies rapidly to plan and attain a balanced, rational and massive expansion.
4. African societies have not, for the most part, developed powerful and well-entrenched bourgeois classes who could effectively resist socialism and socialist ideas. The capitalists in Africa have largely been foreigners, connected with or dependent on the colonial regimes. Hence, the patriotic anti-colonialist upsurge of the masses has had, and still has, a powerful anti-capitalist content. The foremost fighters for African liberation have been the working class, standard-bearer of socialist ideas, and their closest allies, the African peasants. The *African* peasant has, over huge areas, never adopted or been attracted by the system of private ownership of land, and therefore the socialist conception of common ownership is clear and understandable.
5. African countries are attaining their independence in the era of the disintegration of world capitalism and imperialism, of the swift advance of the socialist countries, socialist ideas and socialist movements, to a position of decisive importance and influence on an international scale. It is precisely this factor which gives African countries the opportunity to proceed directly from pre-capitalist to socialist societies, without having to pass through the degrading and dehumanising period of capitalist individualism, selfishness and exploitation, in which man becomes a wolf to his brother and profits by trampling others down into the mud.

These are some of the reasons for the magnetic appeal of socialism and socialist ideas for African workers, peasants, thinkers and patriots. It is difficult or impossible for any African statesman or leader to come out openly before the masses as a defender of capitalism and an opponent of socialism.

Unfortunately, however, most Africans for a variety of reasons arising out of the colonialist past, are not well informed about socialism. Various people therefore are able to put across the most misleading ideas under the label of 'socialism' or 'African socialism' —ideas which have nothing in common with either socialism or with African patriotism.

For example, Mr. Tom Mboya, Kenya Minister for Constitutional Affairs, writes an article entitled 'African Socialism' in the Uganda magazine *Transition* (March 1963). It would be fair to say that anyone reading this article in the hope of learning more about socialism will end up being even more confused than he was before he read it. Either Mr. Mboya does not understand what socialism is, or he does know but prefers capitalism, which he tries to sell to his readers under the label 'socialism'. He wraps everything up in such a fog of vague verbiage that it is difficult to find out exactly what, if anything, he is saying. Take this, for a start:

> 'When I talk of "African Socialism" I refer to those proven codes of conduct in the African societies which have, over the ages, conferred dignity on our people and afforded them security regardless of their station in life. I refer to universal charity which characterised our societies and I refer to the African's thought processes and cosmological ideas, which regard man, not as a social means, but as an end and entity in the society.'

Now we may admire many 'codes of conduct' in traditional African society, and we shall seek to preserve and build upon them in the New Africa. But it is absurd to take some traditional folkways, add to them 'security' (when did our people, one wonders, really enjoy security?), 'charity' (we want rights, not charity!), add some high-flown talk about 'African thought processes and cosmological ideas' —and call the result 'socialism'.

Socialism is a definite and specific system of ideas and society, based not upon the tribal past but the modern, highly organised and industrial future. The effect—if not the purpose—of this sort of vague word-spinning is to link 'socialism' with the past, not the future, and to confuse the reader.

Mr. Mboya goes on, however, to admit that socialism is not only an African idea, that its 'basic tenets . . . are universal and we are

either socialists or not at all.' Fine; but he then goes on to give a 'definition' of socialism which merely leads to confusion worse confounded:

> *'Socialism is a mental conditioning or an attitude of mind established in order to achieve rational relationship and harmony in the society.'*

MISTAKEN CONCEPTION

It is worth dwelling on this formulation, because it is basic to a good deal of what is mistaken in Mr. Mboya's approach. 'In Africa,' he says, 'the belief that we are all sons (and daughters) of the soil has exercised tremendous influence on our social, economic and political relationships. Arising from this *belief* is the logic and practice of equality. . . . Also, arising from the same *belief* is the communal ownership of the vital means of life—the land.' (My emphasis.—T. A.)

In these formulations the writer is confusing cause and effect. He imagines that African societies held the land in common because of some special African 'belief' or *theory* of social relationships. Now, it is perfectly true that traditional African concepts on the organisation of society have many noble features and have much in common with socialism. One cannot quarrel much with Mr. Mboya when he writes:

> 'Laziness was not tolerated and there were appropriate social sanctions and ethics to encourage hard work and industriousness. Poverty existed but it was not due to man exploiting man. The social, cultural and economic gap was not great. . . . There was equality of opportunity. The acquisitive instinct . . . was tempered by a sense of togetherness and rejection of graft and meanness. . . .'

But, one must ask, where did these good ideas and practices come from? They did not arise out of the air, but out of the way of life of the African people, the way in which they organised themselves to make a living in the hard struggle against Nature. As Karl Marx put it in one of those illuminating flashes of profound wisdom which has placed generations of socialists so deeply in his debt:

> **'It is not man's consciousness which determines his social being; but on the contrary, it is his social being which determines his consciousness.'**

In other words it was the communist character of traditional African society, based on the common ownership of the means of production (the land), which explains the communist content of much of traditional African social thought and practice—not the other

way round. And this common ownership did not arise out of any exceptional African 'belief' about land ownership. It arose because the techniques and instruments of agricultural production had not developed beyond the point where an individual or a family could produce more from the land than was necessary for their own needs. Therefore there was no conceivable purpose in a man owning, or having the use of, more land than he himself could cultivate.

Nor was there any basis or purpose in the exploitation of man by man. For exploitation only becomes possible when productive techniques are efficient enough for a man to produce a *surplus* over and above his own essential requirements of life and reproduction.

What is the essence of exploitation? It is that one man is able to produce such a surplus—and that surplus is *appropriated* by another without equivalent compensation. When productive techniques are at such a low level of development as to make this impossible there can, for example, be no slavery—the crudest and primary form of exploitation, of which all other forms, including capitalist exploitation of wage-labour, are mere refinements and elaborations. If a slave's full time and energies are taken up in labour to produce food and shelter for himself and his family there is no point in *having* a slave, and there are no slaves. If a tribe or community defeats another in war under such conditions, the losers are either put to death or absorbed as equal working members of the victorious community—otherwise they would be just so many useless mouths to feed. It is only with the further development of the techniques and instruments of production to the stage where a surplus can be produced that it becomes possible and profitable to introduce a slave system.

So the socialist consciousness of which Mr. Mboya speaks was certainly present in traditional African society—to a greater or lesser extent, depending on the degree of development towards slave or feudal systems present in each particular part of Africa—which itself depended on the degree of technical development attained in that part of our continent. But that socialist consciousness did not depend on abstract theories: it grew naturally out of the actual conditions of life and labour in those societies. 'Laziness was not tolerated', for the simple reason that if everyone did not work there would not be enough to eat; Africans *had* to apply the socialist principle: 'He who does not work, neither shall he eat.' There was no exploitation because exploitation cannot exist without surplus value.

This socialist consciousness will help to provide favourable conditions for the development of modern socialist societies in Africa;

but such societies will have to be built consciously by clear-headed and determined fighters for socialism, who understand the necessity for unremitting struggle against capitalist institutions, practices and ideas.

Mr. Mboya shows his failure to grasp the essential principle that 'Man's social being determines his consciousness' once again, when he writes that Africans have at least tempered 'the acquisitive instinct *which is largely responsible for the vicious excesses and exploitation under capitalism*'. He misses the whole point. It is precisely *the capitalist system itself* which is 'responsible for' and which fosters and gives rise to the money-mad individualism, greed and disregard of human life and welfare which is characteristic of capitalism, and which one supposes he means by 'the acquisitive instinct'.

It is not that the individual capitalist himself is necessarily a bad and a wicked man, but that the whole system under which he lives teaches him that the highest good is his own enrichment and accumulation of wealth, regardless of how much suffering and death this process may cause others.

If Africans have thus far escaped this vicious and degrading outlook it is not because merely of some exceptional virtue and nobility inherent in our people—although we all like to feel we are better than others; it is because for historical reasons we have for the most part not undergone the phase of capitalist industrialism—and, with sound socialist leadership, one hopes we never shall.

And one should add that it is not only we Africans who have gone through the phase of simple tribal communism with its noble virtues of unselfishness, social consciousness, democracy, equality and refusal to tolerate idlers and parasites. Historical science and research tell us that *all* human societies everywhere have gone through this stage of development, even though some of them are much further removed from it in time than ourselves.

DON'T IDEALISE THE PAST

Africans still have a fairly close connection and continuing relationship with the traditions of common ownership, lack of class differentiation, social consciousness rather than individualism, and freedom from exploitation which Africa knew before the intrusion of the colonialists, which irrevocably changed our destiny and the course of our history. And, as suggested above, modern African socialists should cherish these sound traditions and build upon them for the future.

At the same time, however, we should avoid the temptation to idealise our past, to forget its negative features, or imagine that we can solve our problems in this nuclear and space-travel epoch by returning to some mythical 'golden age'. The early period of tribal communism had certain features in common with modern communism and socialism. But it has vital differences as well. In some ways modern communism is the opposite and final negation of the old. After a long historical period of development through inner conflicts, human society is returning to its original communist form —a classless, non-exploitive society of equals. But whereas ancient communism was a 'sharing' of the barest *scarcity*, so severe that there was nothing over for greed and selfishness to appropriate, modern communism is a sharing of the abundant *wealth*, health and culture to which science and industry have given us the key.

This means that African socialists and communists must not look nostalgically to the static rural, tribal and agricultural Africa of the past. They must look forward to and work with the utmost energy for the dynamic, urban and rural industrialised and electrified Africa of the future.

In his article in *Transition*, Mr. Mboya proceeds to outline a number of economic reforms for Kenya 'under the guidance of our socialist tradition'. He gives first priority to agricultural reform 'since over three-quarters of Kenya's population depends on agriculture', with the objects of expanding employment and providing more food, to export more crops for foreign exchange, to accelerate rural development, and 'to lay the foundation for industrialisation by processing raw materials for export abroad and for the East African market'. It is not possible in this article to examine in detail the various proposals put for agricultural reform; for the most part they are sound enough and in harmony with the progressive policy of KANU—although one would have liked to see more explanation of and more emphasis placed on Agricultural Co-operatives and land reform.

However, Mr. Mboya proceeds to say: 'Agricultural development alone is not enough. The development of trade and industry must be accorded second highest priority. . . .' It is not only in the order of these 'priorities', but above all in the detailed proposals which he submits under this head, which furnish the clearest illustration of his strange understanding of 'socialism'.

'Our government,' he starts off promisingly enough, 'should participate directly in the vital industrial undertakings.' But how is it to do this?

It should 'provide funds for training local entrepreneurs'. What, you may ask, is an *entrepreneur*? It is a trick word used by bourgeois economists, meaning 'capitalists'. I suspect that Mr. Mboya uses it because he believes most of his readers will not know what it means, and because he knows they would object to the use of public funds for the training of capitalists, or 'to enable them to participate in industry'.

Secondly, 'our government should establish a Development Bank to offer loans to industries and to organise the flow of foreign capital'. In other words, Mr. Mboya's 'socialist' plan consists in *helping* local and foreign capitalists with loans. He also thinks that 'industries' (by which he obviously means privately-owned industries) should be helped by the government with 'services like research, etc.'.

'Lastly . . . the government should *stimulate private investment* . . .' in industry and trade. It is true that he adds, 'while at the same time offering the wage-earners and primary producers security of income and employment'.

There are two major criticisms to be made of this economic blue-print, put forward in an article allegedly dealing with 'African Socialism'. In the first place it is entirely inadequate. The people of Kenya have struggled and sacrificed in a hard struggle for many bitter years to win an African Government, and having won it they will expect, not miracles overnight, but immediate, vigorous and visible steps to restore the land to the people, to lay the basis for powerful industrial advance and to liquidate the colonialist heritage of backwardness, poverty and ignorance. The plan as explained by Mr. Mboya does nothing to accomplish these things. True, he may object that this is a practical, immediate plan for the interim period, leading to greater things in the future. But he does not say so; indeed, he puts forward his programme in a manner and in a context which can only lead his reader to conclude that it is meant to be a socialist programme. And this brings us to the second major criticism of this article——

For there is one thing this programme most definitely is not—and that is a programme for socialism. In order to appreciate this point thoroughly, we must go back and consider exactly what socialism —whether 'African', 'Asian', 'European' or anywhere else—IS.

WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

Let us be quite blunt and straightforward. Socialism is *not* 'a mental conditioning'. It is not 'an attitude of mind'. It is a quite definite

ideology, based on well-known principles. Let us, briefly, restate a few of those principles:

1. Socialists are opposed to the capitalist system of production, based on private ownership of the means of production—the factories, mines, land, etc., and the exploitation of man by man.

2. **Socialists work for a socialist system, based upon the common ownership of the means of production.**

3. The capitalists will not voluntarily relinquish power and ownership. Therefore it is necessary for the workers to organise as a class for the overthrow of capitalist class rule and the conquest of state power, in order to abolish the exploitation of man by man and build a classless society, with equal rights and opportunities for all.

If one accepts and works for these aims, one is a socialist. If one doesn't, one is not. And if one judges by his article, Mr. Mboya, whatever else he may be, is no socialist!

He apparently feels that the 'definitions' referred to above are pretty inadequate, for he attempts yet another, this time 'in the general concept':

> 'Socialism stands for equality of opportunity, security of income and employment, equality before the law, the rule of law, individual freedom, universal franchise, state regulation of economic life, state control of vital means of production and distribution, etc.'

Here, in fact, is the core of the matter. Let us examine with care this last of his 'definitions'.

We may all agree, whether we are socialists or not, that such things as 'equality' of opportunity and legal rights, 'security', the rule of law, freedom and democracy, are all very desirable things. Even supporters of capitalism do not (or dare not) oppose them. In fact the whole nub of the argument between, on the one hand, socialists and communists, and, on the other, the supporters of capitalism or 'private enterprise', is precisely this—*which system is better able to provide the people with security, freedom, democracy and a good life?*

We socialists and communists say capitalism cannot provide these things. We say that there can be *no* security while an unplanned, capitalist economy throws, at any moment, millions into unemployment and crises of 'overproduction'. We say that there can be no true equality while the rich class has the privilege of exploiting our

labour power and waxing fat on unearned incomes derived from our sweat. We say political democracy is a fraud as long as *economic* power is concentrated in the hands of the few who own the means of production.

Therefore the vital and central issue is: who owns the means of production? Either it is the working masses, expressing themselves through their own state. Or else it is the private owners—who, because of their private ownership, will really control the state itself, a capitalist state.

Mr. Mboya begs this crucial question and leaves it unanswered.

He speaks, not of public *ownership*, but of a state *control* of 'vital means of production and distribution, etc.'. By using this formulation he *blurs* and *obliterates* the crucial distinction between capitalism and socialism. Ownership is *not* the same as 'control'. It is impossible to run a modern economy without a certain degree of state control over vital industries. Thus, even in the United States of America, the home of capitalist 'free enterprise', the state, to some extent, controls such matters as labour regulations, prices, etc. Not so long ago President Kennedy told the American steel bosses not to put up their prices, because of the inflationary effect it would have on the economy. Yet no one in his right senses would claim that the United States is socialist or even at present moving in a socialist direction!

In Britain, state control goes even further, and certain important sectors of the British economy have even been nationalised—such as the railways and the coal mines. But by no stretch of the imagination could the United Kingdom, whether under a Tory or a Labour government, be described as a socialist society.

The essence of the question is twofold:

First, socialism means *public ownership*. Any system of 'control' that leaves ownership in the hands of private capitalists is not socialism but a form of regulated *state capitalism*, designed not to benefit the workers and the toiling masses, but to exploit them more efficiently. The capitalists themselves are turning increasingly to this type of 'control'—in order to keep the system going and to facilitate militarisation of society and preparations for war.

Socialist *planning* is impossible while private capitalists own the means of production. The capitalists produce in accordance with the anarchic ups and downs of the market, the so-called laws of supply and demand, not in accordance with the needs of the people for a better life and a better future. Capitalist production is designed for private profit, not for the public benefit. Nothing can alter this state

of affairs until the main means of production are taken out of the hands of capitalists and placed under common ownership.

Second, when we talk about 'state' ownership or control, we must ask: '*Whose state?*' Socialism means that the state itself must cease to be a dictatorship of the capitalist minority. The state of the exploiters must be broken up and replaced by a true democracy, a dictatorship of the working class. A state dominated by exploiters and headed by believers in capitalism cannot build socialism or inspire the creative energy of the masses. 'Nationalisation' of certain industries and services by a capitalist state must *not* be confused with socialism. In South Africa the state controls certain vital industrial undertakings as steel (ISCOR) and coal-derived oil and petrol (SASOL). The railways, airways and harbours are *state-owned* and operated. But no sane African could claim that control or even ownership by the criminal apartheid state has anything at all in common with socialism.

Turn back now and reconsider the practical economic proposals put forward under the label of 'African socialism' and you will see that they contain no socialism at all. It is a plan for training indigenous capitalists and helping them to set up in business to exploit their fellow-Africans. It is a plan to attract foreign and local investors, who will only be interested in making profits for themselves and not at all in advancing Kenya on the path to economic development and socialism. It is a plan for capitalist development in Kenya.

There are two main objections to this plan: firstly it is misleading and deceptive to tell the people that this is socialism when it is nothing of the sort. And secondly that it will not lead the people of Kenya to their goals of defeating poverty, disease, backwardness and other consequences of colonialism nearly as rapidly and purposefully as a genuinely socialist plan would do.

'INTELLECTUAL IMPERIALISM'

We Africans have had enough, and more than enough, of self-appointed 'advisers', some of them well-meaning, others by no means so, who come out to Africa from abroad to tell us how to run our own affairs. Many of them are poorly informed about African conditions, problems and aspirations, and the motives of some of them are by no means above suspicion. We want and need to study the techniques and experiences of other peoples in other continents. But we want to choose and apply this knowledge ourselves. Then at

least, if we make mistakes, they will be our own mistakes and we shall not have to blame anyone else for them ; that is what is meant by freedom.

Mr. Mboya plays upon this widespread and justified feeling when he warns his readers against what he calls 'intellectual imperialism' and 'foreign slogans'. 'Let us go abroad,' he writes, 'to ask for loans and technical skills, not for ideals and ideologies.'

And he cautions his readers against 'the blueprints of the West or the East'.

There would appear to be a few traps or land-mines hidden under these not entirely ingenuous formulations.

In the first place, we must be very careful to distinguish between the *principles* and *ideology* of socialism, which are universal, and concrete *application* and plans ('blueprints' if you like) of these principles to the special circumstances of any given country, which must be local and specific.

If we are talking about principles and ideology then there is no such thing as 'Eastern' or 'Western' or 'African' socialism. There is only socialism. Just as there is no such thing as 'Eastern' mathematics or 'European' astronomy.

But, since socialism is not a mere abstraction but living practice, the precise path to socialism will differ in detail according to the special historical and national factors of each country, which naturally vary from one region to another.

One thing, however, is certain: the charting of the specific path towards socialism in any country can only be successfully accomplished by those who have mastered the universal science of socialism itself.

Mr. Mboya muddles this simple truth when he tries to foster the idea that there are different varieties of socialism.

'When I talk of socialist attitudes,' he says, '*those of us who have grown up under the intellectual climate of the Western world will no doubt be thinking of socialism of the Western type.*' He adds, with an ill-concealed sneer, that there are, 'of course', others who will be thinking in terms of '*a Marxian type of socialism*'. (My emphases. —T. A.)

What is this 'socialism of the Western type' of which Mr. Mboya writes? (He includes himself in those of 'us' who 'have grown up under the intellectual climate of the Western world'.) It would seem from the woolly formulations and the deliberate avoidance of the crucial issues of socialist theory and practice that he has in mind the so-called 'socialism' of the British Labour Party which flourished

under the fatal leadership of men like the late Mr. Gaitskell. But, as Africans who have studied modern British political developments should understand very well, this was not socialism at all, but a wretched compromise born out of the apparently incurable tendency of British Labour leaders to collaborate in the maintenance of British imperialism under the banner of a shoddy pretence at socialism. So far from advancing the cause of socialism, this type of leadership and theory has done more to discredit it than the capitalists themselves.

Britain has had three Labour governments—all of them trying to save what they could of the British empire. There have been a number of similar (social democratic) governments in Scandinavian countries and pre-war Germany. Not a single one of these governments has taken any of these countries one serious step nearer to socialism. Instead of introducing socialism, they have merely been content to administer the capitalist state and to maintain its essential institutions intact.

The only countries in the world which have introduced socialism are those in which the working class, under the leadership of Marxist-Leninist parties, have destroyed the capitalist state, replaced it with a state under the rule of the workers, placed the main industries under public ownership and mobilised the people to work consciously for the socialist transformation of society.

Thus, there are not various 'brands' of socialism. In the brief century that has passed since Karl Marx and Fredrich Engels founded the modern communist movement, Marxism has vanquished all other, non-scientific theories of socialism and proved itself the only correct and scientific theory of socialism.

In attempting to smuggle the so-called 'Western' deviations from and revisions of socialist thought into Africa, it is indeed Mr. Mboya, and those misled people who think like him, who are, consciously or unconsciously, guilty of 'intellectual imperialism'. For this Western socialism is nothing more or less than an attempt to introduce imperialist ideology and apologies for colonialism into the clear mainstream of socialist thought and consciousness.

'African socialism' is either the conscious and well-informed work of African socialists to apply the correct and universally-valid principles of scientific socialism—Marxism-Leninism—to practical African conditions—or it is not socialism at all.

The essence of this question is expressed clearly in *The Road to South African Freedom*, the programme of the South African Communist Party:

'It is true that the precise paths of the African peoples towards socialism will differ from those of peoples of other continents, due to differences of national tradition and history, to the long period of colonialist domination which, amongst other factors, has prevented the development of African societies along the same lines as those in Europe and Asia. But the whole of international experience has proved beyond any shadow of doubt, that the main truths of Marxism-Leninism are fully applicable to countries in every stage of social development. The only road towards a socialist and communist future is that indicated by Marxism. The innumerable attempts, in many parts of the world, to propound or practise "non-Marxist socialism", or to "revise", "modify" and "improve" Marxism-Leninism, have one and all ended in disaster and betrayal of the working class.'

By a socialist society we mean one which approaches nearer a state of affairs in which each gives according to his ability and receives according to his needs.

—Jomo Kenyatta, Prime Minister of Kenya and President of the Kenya African National Union.

A New AC Feature

From time to time, documents appear of outstanding international importance and major importance to Africa—but are not generally available to the African reader. The AFRICAN COMMUNIST will, from time to time, reproduce such documents in this section of our Journal. In this issue we print the following documents:

1 *Chief Lutuli's Appeal 'to all lovers of freedom wherever they may be' to stop arming the Verwoerd regime for war against Africa. The message was sent to the Anti-Apartheid Movement, London, in May, 1963.*

2 *President Castro's speech—to an audience of 125,000—at the Lenin Central Stadium, Moscow, on the occasion of the termination of the visit of a Cuban delegation which he headed to the Soviet Union. The meeting, attended by Premier Nikita Khrushchov, was held on May 24, 1963.*

DOCUMENT 1

NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA

A. J. Lutuli

I GREET ALL LOVERS of freedom, wherever they may be. From my village in South Africa, where I have been confined for years by the Nationalist Party Government, I send greetings on behalf of the oppressed people of my country to all our friends throughout the world.

I am happy to think that there are many millions all over the world who are concerned with the unhappy plight of South Africa. I speak to you at a time when there is much reason for sadness in South Africa. But also at a time when there is reason for rising hope and renewed courage.

On the one hand we have the tragic spectacle of the South African white minority government armed to the hilt to crush the legitimate aspirations of the people: on the other we have the heartening sight of the overwhelming majority of the civilised world

uniting in a resolution which condemns in the most absolute terms the tyranny under which South Africa groans.

The forces of oppression and racial discrimination which have pressed heavily on us for so long are increasing in their viciousness, in their ruthless disregard for human values, in the ferocity of their attacks on a patient and reasonable people who have been, and even at this late stage still are, prepared to work out in calmness a just settlement of the conflicts in our land. And in spite of the increasing burden of oppression, it cheers me to know that the people as a whole continue to struggle for justice with fortitude and unabated patience.

Yet it is necessary to calculate as exactly as possible the terrible destructive forces which are being built up in our country. They can be measured in the flood of repressive laws, destructive of human rights and human dignity, which pour out from the legislative machine: in the assaults on human rights in the form of banishments, confinements, house arrests, gaggings and police persecution. They can be measured in the wholesale removals of people ruthlessly torn up from homes they have built up at great sacrifice from their meagre earnings: in the unceasing treadmill of arrests for statutory offences, principally under the pass laws, when people are unable to establish their right to be in the land of their birth: in Group Areas Acts, Job-Reservation and attacks on the press and freedom of speech: in the ruthless carving up of our country into racial kraals for whites and non-whites: in the dismembering of the land into Bantustans—only 13 per cent of the land for us Africans, comprising 75 per cent of the population, and in the obscurantist retreat into a tribal past for both white and non-white.

Most terrible of all, we measure the coming tide of destruction in terms of the massive build-up of military power against an unarmed people whose sole crime is their demand for the most elementary forms of human justice.

RULE BY VIOLENCE

All this preparation for what? For a further series of Sharpevilles? Is it any wonder that among the people of our country suffering from intense oppression—deprivation of home and family, of livelihood and of hope, there are some who, goaded beyond human endurance to the point of desperation, see no way out but to engage in desperate forms of reckless violence? Nor is it, humanly speaking,

to be wondered at that there are those who are embarking on calculated acts of violence because they have been forced to abandon all hope of reaching a just solution by consultation and negotiation.

But the Government has insanely committed itself to rule by the machine gun and armoured car: has elected to go down in a messy welter of blood and destruction rather than work out a clean and honourable solution. The Police vote of 1962 soared to R40 million: the Prisons vote to R10½ million: the Defence vote—greater than that in wartime—to R120 million.

Helicopters, paratroopers, white women's pistol clubs, armoured cars, strafing planes, automatic weapons, the integration of the police force—'one of the largest police forces . . .' with the Army—the whole ferocious panoply of War is being marshalled—in peace time and with the frank avowal that it is not for any outside enemy but to put down the people of the land. This is the pitiful state of my country today.

Saddening as this is, there are other features of the situation which increase our sadness. Those who are providing the government with these terrifying weapons of destruction are countries which allegedly care for human freedom. Certainly, some of them have a proud record in the defence of human liberties. Almost all of them have known the travail of war, of conflict against ruthless oppression: have known the bitterness of race-hatred and the wounds of armed conflict. Yet these countries today, and Britain foremost among them, are guilty of arming the savage Nationalist Party regime. The Saracens built in Britain have already left an indelible blot on the history of my country: now it seems that your Buccaneers and your tanks must leave their foul imprint.

Happily, the vast majority of civilised countries have shown their detestation of this foul regime. The most spectacular demonstration of this was the vote in support of the resolution in the General Assembly of the United Nations which called for sanctions against South Africa.

U.N. RESOLUTION

I would remind you that the resolution called on all states to break off diplomatic relations, or refrain from establishing them: close their ports to all vessels flying the South African flag and enact legislation prohibiting their ships from entering South African ports: boycott all South African goods: refrain from exporting

goods, including arms and ammunition, to South Africa, and refuse landing facilities to South African aircraft.

On behalf of all the oppressed people and all freedom lovers in South Africa, I wish to make it clear that we welcome this resolution most joyfully: that we look forward to, and entreat, its most stringent implementation, and that we would encourage the most vigorous forms of action in protest against the apartheid policies which blight our country.

At the same time I would urge citizens in all countries to be vigilant in ensuring that these resolutions are honoured in words as well as action, and to campaign energetically for their fullest implementation by their governments and by all private enterprises and individuals.

I must remind you too that the same resolution drew the attention of the world to, and expressed regret at, the fact that some member-states indirectly provide encouragement to the South African government to perpetuate segregation. This is a matter of grave concern to all of us and calls for demonstration by all of us of our abhorrence of it, particularly by those who are still free to speak and act, and who have not been crippled, as many of us have been, by the strangling restrictions of a virtual police state.

I would ask you to unite in demanding that your governments should honour the resolutions taken at the United Nations. I would urge that you and your government be not deterred from any action by the excuse—often advanced by our oppressors—that boycotts and sanctions will bring to us, blacks, more suffering than the whites. We have been victims of suffering long before our boycott and sanctions call to nations of the world. We are committed to suffering that will lead us to freedom—as it has been the lot of all oppressed people before us from time immemorial. What we are determined not to do, cost what it may, is to acquiesce in a *status quo* that makes us semi-slaves in OUR COUNTRY.

I would ask you in particular to unite in protesting, vociferously and unremittingly, against the shipment of arms to South Africa. On this issue let your voice be clear and untiring: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

When you contemplate the mass of cruelly repressive legislation, when you observe the horrifying pitiful tale of human suffering and indignity, and when you see the way this fair country is blasted by the racially insane, let your cry be: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

And when you visualise the terrible havoc which may be wreaked on South Africa, havoc of which Sharpeville was the merest minor

portent, by the most deadly and destructive military weapons known to modern man, let your cry be: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

SHARPEVILLE

If you have any doubts, if you think this is a gross and hysterical exaggeration, let me give you a single example of the callous disregard for human life which permeates those who rule South Africa: speaking at the current session of the all-white South African Parliament, a Cabinet Minister referred to Sharpeville as 'an ordinary police action'. An ordinary police action in which 67 unarmed defenceless men, women and children were shot dead and 180 wounded! This is an 'ordinary police action'. What of the extraordinary actions of the future for which the government is now frantically preparing?

When you contemplate this grim and bloody prospect, surely it is your duty as an individual and the duty of all to ensure that no such foul assault on human beings should be perpetrated. Surely you must join in the great united cry: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

I direct a special appeal to all the workers of the world, who share with us, not only the common brotherhood of labour, but who in many instances have shared with us a common suffering and hardship. I appeal to them to make their voices heard and to show their unity with us not only in words but in actions. To those working in the factories where these deadly weapons are manufactured, I say make sure that your labour is not used to produce the weapons which will deal death to the people of my country. And to those who have any part in the transaction—the dockworkers, the sailors, the airport workers and all others, I say: let your opposition be shown, not only in your cry: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA, but also in your resolute refusal to lend your labour for this foul purpose.

Perhaps it is futile to appeal to those who put profits before justice and human lives. Nevertheless, in all sincerity, I appeal to them to pause and re-think their sense of values which puts material values before human lives. For this is the meaning of their making available their murderous wares to the South African government.

The time must surely come when South Africa must emerge from the dark night of racial fanaticism to take its place among the free nations of the world. You all—people and governments—can, to your honour, hasten this day.

The Nationalist juggernaut, top-heavy with its crushing weight of military might, is crumbling and rotten at the base. Its present show of strength is a facade to hide its hastening decay and doom. The duty of all who find the regime repugnant to mankind is to hasten this day. A regime that flouts world opinion cannot last. Nor will such a regime endure when many of its own citizens are resolute and pledged to work for that end even at the cost of limitless sacrifice. For we are steeled by oppression, and the daily sight of human values being ground underfoot only makes us cherish even more those values.

CAST ASIDE HYPOCRISY

To the nations and governments of the world, particularly those directly or indirectly giving aid and encouragement to this contemptible Nationalist regime, I say: cast aside your hypocrisy and deceit: declare yourself on the side of oppression if that is your secret design. Do not think we will be deceived by your pious protestations as long as you are prepared to condone, assist and actively support the tyranny in our land. The test is your stand on the principle: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA. No expressions of concern, no platitudes about injustice will content us. The test is action —action against oppression.

We look forward to the day when we shall be, with all the free peoples of the world, brothers, brothers-in-arms against injustice, anywhere, and at any time. But our immediate task is the freeing of our land: a task in which we look for support to lovers of freedom in the world. All lovers of freedom can help. All can do something to make the resolution for sanctions a reality. Whoever you are, whatever you may be, it is possible for you to assist. In your church, in your educational, or political, or labour, or cultural, or sporting organisation, it is possible for you to assist in exerting the pressures which will isolate this political pariah and lead to its extermination. All may play their part in ending this oppression, and all may—and must—join in the resolute declaration: NO ARMS FOR SOUTH AFRICA.

DOCUMENT 2

THIS IS COMMUNISM

Fidel Castro

DEAR COMRADE NIKITA SERGEYEVICH KHRUSHCHOV, first secretary of the central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, comrades of the C.P.S.U. central committee, Soviet citizens, although we shall stay for some time longer in the Soviet Union, today ends the official part of our visit to your great country.

In other words, we take leave today of the Muscovites and all the Soviet people. I have prepared my speech in writing, for it seemed to me that would be better for everybody, both for the interpreter and myself, since I do not know your language.

Today I must thank you, although, for understandable reasons, this is not an easy task for us on whom an avalanche of love has descended.

Our visit to the Soviet Union has naturally been highly instructive for our delegation. We came here full of gratitude to the friendly Land of the Soviets which, over a distance of thousands on thousands of miles, is rendering our revolution decisive and invaluable help.

This time, however, we came face to face with Soviet life and with our Soviet brothers, for the first time.

All that this country represents, all that has been accomplished by its people, its achievement, its heroism, its history—it is impossible to get an adequate idea of all this by reading books and documents, by seeing films and photographs. One must feel it for oneself.

There exist in the world, so to speak, two Soviet Unions. There is the true heroic Soviet Union, which was built and defended by the blood and sacrifice of the workers and peasants: the Soviet Union that ushered in a new era for mankind and carried into the history of revolution the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin: the first socialist state, the first motherland of liberated working people,

which ensured the rapid development of the national economy, culture and science at an unprecedented pace.

There exists another 'Soviet Union', the one portrayed by reactionary enemies with the help of the worst methods, presented by the papers of the monopoly capital, portrayed by the corrupt politicians of the exploiting classes and by venal writers.

We were born in a country that was ruled by American monopolies, that was ruled by landlords and the bourgeoisie. The organs of state power, the military apparatus and other administrative institutions, all the press, radio, cinema, books and schools in our country, spread slander of the Soviet Union by every means.

The enemies of the working class resorted not only to repression, but to the ideological weapon, their main weapon, deceit, so as to hold the masses in subjugation and to repress their revolutionary spirit.

The spectre of communism, of which Marx spoke, is also haunting Latin America: but the exploiters are trying to use it as a bogy for the exploited. They slander Marxism-Leninism, saying that this teaching is foreign, hostile to the country, to society and to freedom, the family and the individual. For the bourgeoisie, country, society, freedom, the family and the individual have always meant one thing —private property.

For the sake of the private ownership of the means of production, they sell the country to the imperialists, corrupt the family, stifle freedom and create a bestial society which, divided into those who exploit and those who are exploited, enslaves the individual.

PROFITS BEFORE MORALITY

Paupers, prostitutes, unemployed, homeless children, waifs, illiterates—these groups are numerous even in the most developed capitalist society. Morals, culture, family and human individuality are cruelly subjugated to the interests of capitalists, the interests of the private ownership of the means and tools of production.

How then, living in these conditions, only 90 miles away from the mightiest capitalist power, whose influence, whose propaganda and whose ideology have swamped our people, could this people free itself, shatter the chains, and destroy the prejudices, adopt communism, and create the first socialist state on the American continent?

Even the imperialists would not think of declaring that the Soviet Union exported revolution to Cuba.

The Marxist-Leninist principle that capitalism and imperialism inevitably dig a grave for themselves and produce their own grave diggers in the masses of exploited peasants and workers has been confirmed once again. Despite all falsehoods and slanders, despite repressions and brutalities, despite the propaganda and crimes of the imperialists, the Cuban workers and farmers have buried the old capitalist society for ever, like a corpse that will never come to life again.

Of course, revolution is not carried out in a laboratory. The accomplishment of living historical reality is carried out by the mass of the people. Jose Marti, an outstanding and highly educated thinker, used to say that not everything in a revolution has the fragrance of carnations.

Those who make an idealistic approach to the understanding of history think that a revolution must develop according to the laws of a well-composed piece of music, without the slightest hitch. Not a single revolution is free from mistakes, even big mistakes, which can be made by some individual.

Of course, these mistakes are always used by enemies and are exaggerated in every way by them. But revolutions, as a phenomena of history, as a new form of human society, as a creation of the masses, are events which, by their greatness, eclipse the mistakes of individuals. Every overcoming of a mistake consolidates the revolution, strikes the ideological weapon out of the hands of its enemies, and makes the ideas of communism more attractive in the eyes of mankind.

Everything is useful experience, everything is instructive in a revolution. That is why the communist movement is becoming ever stronger, and the prestige of Marxist-Leninist ideas is growing throughout the world with every passing day, despite the frenzied campaign of the class enemies of the working people.

How could our revolution, so far away, geographically, from the socialist camp, withstand and survive under the very nose of the most powerful imperialist country?

The heroism of our people, its exceptional patriotic spirit, its readiness to pay any price for the defence of the revolution, would be insufficient if, at the moment of the Cuban revolution, there had been no absolutely new, objective conditions in Latin America favouring the struggle of the peoples for their liberation.

The Cuban revolution has once again irrefutably confirmed the

Marxist-Leninist thesis that, in the modern world, the balance of forces is no longer in favour of the imperialist camp.

In the history of international relations, based on the moral principles of a class society, the bestial law of brute force reigned from the most ancient times to only recently. With the emergence and growth of the socialist camp, the situation changed fundamentally.

Were it not for the new balance of forces in the modern world, American imperialism would not hesitate to drown the Cuban revolution in blood. And we would not now be building socialism in our country, but would be fighting in the mountains and fields, and in the underground, against foreign forces of occupation.

ARMED INVASION PLANNED

The imperialists, however, will not easily reconcile themselves to reality. They gave up their plans for an armed invasion of our country only after the October crisis.

When, in the middle of last year, the governments of Cuba and the Soviet Union decided to take the requisite measures to prevent the invasion that was being prepared against our country, our policy was fully based on the standards of international law and the United Nations Charter. Cuba saw a threat to its security, and had every reason, based on its sovereign rights, to take steps to strengthen its defence potential.

Without any legal right, the imperialists imposed a naval blockade, which brought the world to the brink of war.

This crisis was the result and consequence of the United States' aggressive policy, which was intended to culminate in an armed invasion. Nevertheless the United States government denied that it was preparing an aggression against our country, and tried to place on Cuba and on the Soviet Union the responsibility for the tension it created. Today the whole world knows who was actually responsible for this crisis.

Thanks to the contradictions that developed between the United States government and the Cuban counter-revolutionaries, the truth came out. The main leader of the counter-revolution, who was appointed by the American government itself, recently declared in a letter which is known to the whole world that the United States had been indeed preparing a military aggression against Cuba.

The settlement of the October crisis, which compelled the United

States to give up the plans for aggression, led to a quarrel between the enemies of our country. This quarrel, in its turn, helped the truth to become known. Time passed, and shed light on the events. The imperialist plans for invading Cuba fell through. It proved possible to avoid war.

The danger remained, however, that the imperialists would assess the events wrongly. The Soviet Union's timely and energetic warning last March, however, acted as a damper on the hot heads of the warlike elements.

With the arrival of our delegation to the U.S.S.R., the imperialists can see how great is the solidarity of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the Soviet government and the Soviet people, with the Cuban revolution.

A GREAT COUNTRY

It will always be a great country, which, for the sake of the defence of a small people, living thousands of miles away, risked the well-being achieved in 45 years of creative work, and at the price of tremendous sacrifices, in a thermonuclear war!

The Soviet Union, which lost more lives in the Great Patriotic War against the fascists than the entire population of Cuba, so as to defend its right to existence and to develop its tremendous riches, did not hesitate to take the risk of a big war in defence of our small country!

History has never known such an example of solidarity. This is true internationalism! This is communism!

This is graphic proof that entirely new relations between big and small nations have been established on the basis of Marxist-Leninist teaching. The warm reception, attention and honour accorded to our delegation in the enormous Soviet Union lift to an unprecedented height the concept of sovereignty and equality between peoples.

The friendship between the Soviet Union and Cuba is truly of extreme importance.

Even before the United States government switched to the policy of armed aggression, it had tried to suppress the Cuban revolution by starvation; but our economic relations with the socialist camp, and the timely economic aid our people received, resulted in the failure of the starvation blockade.

This proves the Marxist-Leninist thesis that the economic exploitation of some countries by others, characteristic of the epoch of colonialism, capitalism and imperialism, completely disappears in relations between socialist states, and yields place to mutually advantageous co-operation and help by the highly developed industrial socialist countries to the countries with weak economies.

Before the beginning of the preparations for direct armed aggression, which made the Soviet Union take preventive measures in Cuba's defence, the imperialists had been preparing mercenary forces in an organised way in order to attack our country.

The arms we got from the Soviet Union and the other socialist camp countries enabled us to rout the aggressor. The imperialists used every possible and conceivable form of aggression, and suffered complete defeat. We always had Soviet help on our side.

The defeat of the imperialists, however, does not mean that they have left us in peace. A number of factors still exist which must be eliminated in order to prevent the risk of another conflict. The United States continues a strict economic blockade of our country. The United States brings pressure to bear on all the states under its influence in order to prevent trade with Cuba. The imperialists organise the military and subversive training of thousands of counter-revolutionaries on their territory.

Counter-revolutionary agents, and weapons for them, are constantly being smuggled into Cuban territory. United States warships and aircraft systematically violate our territorial waters and air space. The intrusion of spy planes serves subversive purposes: recently a pirate plane, which took off from an American base, bombed one of our oil refineries.

Finally, the United States continues to occupy part of our territory, where it has its military base. The United States murders Cuban working people. Saboteurs penetrate to our country from Guantanamo, and all sorts of provocations are committed from that base.

In face of this policy of aggression, Cuba proclaimed its desire to live in peace and to maintain normal relations with all countries of the American continent, including the United States. Our relations with Canada, with Mexico, Brazil and other Latin American countries provide an example of such relations.

The American people is suffering from the economic aggression of its government against Cuba. It no longer has such products as our tobacco, which, for quality, is unique in the world market. And this year the American consumer will have to pay about a

thousand million dollars more for sugar, because very high sugar prices have been reached on the world market. These prices are, to a great extent, caused by the machinations of the United States against Cuban sugar. And it is the American people who are the victims of this unreasonable policy.

The policy of the United States against the Cuban revolution suffered a complete fiasco, and led the government of that country to major political defeats. Hatred for the Cuban revolution is fanned by unprincipled politicians, who are blackmailing the present administration and are attempting to push it to the edge of the precipice of war.

FOR COMMUNIST UNITY

Our people, like all the peoples of the socialist community, want peace so as to continue to build a better life on earth. This struggle for peace, however, as I have often heard Comrade Khrushchov say, demands big sacrifices from our peoples. Our peoples must have armed forces, equipped with the most up-to-date weapons, and kept at full combat readiness.

The might of the socialist camp stays the hand of the lovers of military gambles, guarantees peace and creates the most favourable conditions for the people's struggle against colonial and imperial oppression. The closer the unity of the communist movement, the stronger this movement will be!

This is a self-evident truth which needs no proof. The unity of all progressive and revolutionary forces was the slogan Marx gave to the communists of all countries. Now the unity of the international communist movement is the slogan of all Marxist-Leninists. Workers of all countries unite! This is the behest of Marx and Engels.

Dear Soviet Friends! Our visit to the Soviet Union has enabled us to appreciate on the spot the grandeur of the accomplishments of your people. We know how much hard work and sacrifice they involved.

To a foreigner, the Soviet Union produces an impression of an indestructible fortress. The unity of the Soviet people, the wonderful organisation of your state and your economy, which fill us with admiration, lend even more strength to Soviet society, making it possible for it to undertake the fulfilment of the tremendous task confronting it. The spirit of modesty which we see in every Soviet

citizen, man or woman, is to be wondered at. Lenin would have been proud of everything that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union has done.

We have been able to appreciate in its entire depth the Leninist teaching about the role of the party as the organiser and leader of the masses of people: we have felt the close ties of the party with the people, its tireless concern on all fronts: we have observed the simplicity and modesty of the leaders of the C.P.S.U. and we have seen how they give all their strength to the building of communism.

Having made a great tour of the country, and having lived for nearly a month together with the Soviet people, we are absolutely confident that in a very short time the national economy of the Soviet Union will inevitably surpass the level of the United States.

This fact will have a final, decisive importance for the balance of forces and in refuting the arrogant lies and slander about the Soviet Union spread by the world reactionaries who are living their last days. The slanderers have little time left to cheat the simpletons who still exist on our earth.

LONG LIVE COMMUNISM!

The spectre of communism, that once haunted only Europe, today haunts the whole world. And the day is not far off when all those who are really frightened by this spectre, the exploiters of the working people, will disappear forever.

We are confident that this meeting with the Soviet people will greatly help to strengthen our friendship. We shall carry away with us unforgettable memories of the millions of hands which were raised to welcome the Cuban delegation, the happy smiles and the shouts of greetings which met us everywhere.

I cannot conclude my speech without expressing my deepest gratitude to the man who has tirelessly forged friendship between our peoples—to Comrade Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchov.

We congratulate him most whole-heartedly, and in his person the whole central committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, on the successes which the Soviet Union and its leadership has achieved in the building of communism.

Many thanks, Soviet brothers!

Long live communism!

Our Country or Death!

What our readers write

'RINGING STATEMENT . . .'

A NUMBER OF OUR READERS in Africa and elsewhere have commented favourably on the statement 'The Revolutionary Way Out' issued by the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party and published in our last issue.

A reader in *Kumasi, Ghana,* writes:

Your April-June 1963 issue could not be more timely. The South African Communist Party's ringing statement, "The Revolutionary Way Out", offers a statesmanship desperately needed in today's difficult but promising world. Here stands verity, vigour and VICTORY, *all presented with that modesty and compassion characteristic of greatness. My spirits rose from line to line.'*

The same reader writes about some of the other articles in our last issue. On 'The One-Party State', by B. Pela, she comments that this 'was for me a clarifying document. It tended to answer a good many questions which had been in my mind about this serious matter. I would, however, like to see more discussion of how the function of a working class political party can legitimately be carried on within a progressive one-party state. . . .'

Although she thinks the article 'Right-Wing Labour and Africa', by a special correspondent, was 'important and timely', she believes the author has glossed over the reasons why workers in the imperialist countries are so successfully hoodwinked by the social democrats. 'The workers of the white industrialized world have a rather large "vested interest", in the form of a wage differential, in the continuation of colonialism. . . . Does anyone imagine for one second that, if they were not to such a large degree *sharing* in that "bribery" to which Lenin refers, they would allow right-wing leadership to get away with what it does?'

Another reader writes: 'The statement by the Central Committee of the South African Communist Party in the April issue of THE

AFRICAN COMMUNIST, is of very great importance. I am sending you a donation of money to be used as you see fit to further the cause as presented so ably by the statement.'

'Your Brilliant Periodical'

A reader in *Kano, Northern Nigeria,* writes:

'Permit me to congratulate you on your brilliant periodical. The copy I came across inspired me so much that I feel it my duty to write to you and tell you how much I appreciate your endeavour to cement friendship between us African youth and all our African countries . . . your comrade, in the service of my country.'

An African reader living in *New York,* U.S.A., writes: 'I have just finished reading a copy of THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST given to me by a friend. *I find the ideas expressed therein to be of immense significance in regard to the African solidarity, that could come about only through socialism.*'

A reader in *Southern Rhodesia* finds the issues 'very interesting reading, and I shall circulate them as widely as possible.'

Other Rhodesian readers have not been so fortunate. One in *Northern Rhodesia* complains 'I have not received even a single copy. All copies have been subjected to customs officers at Salisbury, confiscated . . . I am certain that our country needs Marx very badly. The snag lies in government suppression.' Other Rhodesian readers also complain of interference with their copies of our journal by Welensky's Federation authorities. Fortunately, however, the Federation is nearing its end; not a day too soon!

Another African student in the *United States* writes that THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST is 'definitely inspiring, for the only way that can save Africa and other underdeveloped territories from capitalist exploitation is the Marxist philosophy. From my experience in this part of the world, capitalism is anti-humanity and demoralising.'

All the Way to Peking

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST certainly finds its way into many corners of the world. From *Peking,* capital of the People's Republic of *China,* Gregorio Goldenberg, correspondent of the Cuban newspaper, *El Mondo,* writes:—

'I have recently made the discovery of the wonderful materials of your magazine. I am very interested in all African problems.

Your magazine has helped me very much to understand some of the most difficult problems on that subject, and I want to thank you for all this, and for your wonderful contribution to the understanding of African problems.'

From a young reader in *London, England:* 'I consider THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST the leading spearhead in Africa's fight for communism.'

From *Derbyshire,* also in England: 'Best wishes for the future and thank you for keeping your readers so well informed on African affairs.'

From another reader in *New York:* 'Congratulations on a fine publication.'

An African reader at the Sofia State University, *Bulgaria:* 'I am happy because my desire to study in a friendly socialist country has been realised. Here, I shall expand my ideas which were always suppressed by the imperialists in Southern Rhodesia. Everything is O.K. here, except that I still have the language problem which I am sure to overcome in a few months.'

And finally—farthest away of all comes a letter from a reader in faraway *Kanagawa, Japan:* 'I am now striving to get new subscribers for your bulletin. . . . with sincere wishes for your health and good struggle.'

Whether Far or Near

Whether they come from far or near, whether from Africa, Europe, Asia or America, we are always delighted to receive letters from our readers. These letters help us in two ways. They show us which of our articles are most interesting and most appreciated by our readers, and this assists us in planning future issues of our journal.

Secondly, our readers' letters show us that our hard and dangerous struggle of preparing this magazine under the vicious Nazi conditions of South Africa are worth while. We do not ask for or expect any higher reward than this which we get freely and voluntarily from you who read our magazine.

So, keep on writing. We will print what you have to say in this section of our magazine, but we will not print your name unless you want us to do so.

The African Revolution

Under this title New Century Publishers, New York, has published a booklet consisting of three articles by N. Numadé—MARXISM AND AFRICAN LIBERATION, THE CHOICE BEFORE NEW AFRICA and THE WORKING CLASS AND THE AFRICAN REVOLUTION—all of which originally appeared in this journal.

The booklet contains a Foreword by Benjamin J. Davis, well-known American Communist and Negro leader. He writes:

This booklet, which brings together three essays by N. Numadé, African Marxist leader, provides a fundamental and scientific understanding of the historic African liberation movement.

The three essays are taken from *The African Communist*, official organ of the South African Communist Party, which is 'published in the interests of African solidarity and as a forum for Marxist - Leninist thought' throughout the African continent.

As is well known, South Africa is the hellhole of the world when it comes to the sadistic cruelty and brutal exploitation of human beings. Naturally, it has a Communist Party—a truly noble, self-sacrificing and heroic one which is leading the African people to human dignity, equal rights and national salvation. The methods, tactics and role of the Party in the concrete historical conditions of Africa today form the basis of Numadé's essays.

But there is more. It is readily apparent through a thoughtful reading of these articles that there is a broad community of interests between the African liberation movement and the struggles of the Negro people in the United States to abolish the Jim-Crow system and to achieve their immediate first-class citizenship. The concrete conditions of struggle in the United States and Africa are different, the forms and tactics of struggle vary—even among the African countries—but the goals are the same. Both the Negroes of Africa and the Negroes of the United States seek to end racism and its practices, to abolish white supremacy and national oppression and to achieve full equality, human dignity and freedom. Life in a large part of the globe is demonstrating to both the reality that the fullest realization of these goals can be achieved only under socialism. The common enemy of both is Western imperialism —especially United States imperialism, whose monopolists and racists are the arsenal of colonialism in Africa, Asia and Latin America and the fountain head of the Jim-Crow system at home.

The Negroes of Africa and of the United States, obviously, have an abiding common interest and bond; but we in the United States, both Negro and white, will get the most from this pamphlet if we read it receptively to see how much we can learn from this outstanding, authentic voice of the African people.

Price: 2s. 6d.
Obtainable from Ellis Bowles, 52 Palmerston Road, East Sheen, London SW14, England:

or from

New Era Book Subscription Agency
832 Broadway, New York, USA
Price: 35c US

On modern capitalism :

TAKEOVER

William Mennell

The growth of monopoly in Britain 1951-61. The causes, effects and techniques of the takeover-bid movement

25s

THE RULING CLASS

S. Aaronovitch

Finance, industry and the machinery of state in Britain

12s 6d

CAPITALISM YESTERDAY AND TODAY

Maurice Dobb

A popular short study by an eminent economist

2s 6d

On Marxist philosophy:

HISTORICAL MATERIALISM

Maurice Cornforth

New, greatly revised edition of Vol. 2 of *Dialectical Materialism.* Vols. 1 and 3 (*Materialism and the Dialectical Method,)* 7s 6d, and *The Theory of Knowledge*, 12s 6d, also available

10s 6d

MAN AND EVOLUTION

John Lewis

Evolutionary ideas and their significance; a strong rejoinder to racism, "Social Darwinism", etc.

12s 6d

On the British labour movement:

THE LIFE AND IDEAS OF ROBERT OWEN

A. L. Morton

Extracts from Owen's writings, with an introductory essay

18s

BRITISH TRADE UNIONISM, 1800-1961

Allen Hutt

Fifth, revised edition of a now standard work

12s 6d

RIGHT-WING LABOUR, ITS THEORY AND PRACTICE

Emile Burns

Examining the assumptions on which the present policies of the British Labour Party are based

7s 6d

Distributed by:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.
37 Gray's Inn Road
London, W.C.1

LAWRENCE & WISHART

Peace, Freedom and Socialism

English edition of

PROBLEMS OF PEACE AND SOCIALISM

(published in Prague)

Published Monthly *Price: One Shilling and three pence*

Write for a free sample copy to the distributors:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD.

37 Grays Inn Road, London, W.C.1, England

Marxism Today

Theoretical and Discussion Journal of
the Communist Party of Great Britain

Monthly 1*s.* 6*d.*

Subscription rates: 6 *issues* 10*s.* 6*d.*; 12 *issues* 21*s.*

Order from:

CENTRAL BOOKS LTD., 37 GRAYS INN ROAD

LONDON, W.C.1

LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 — Editor: R. Palme Dutt

A Marxist commentary on political events with an international reputation over 41 years in the cause of national liberation and socialism.

2s. monthly — 10/6 half-yearly

DEPT. AC., 134 BALLARDS LANE,
LONDON, N.3. ENGLAND

Leading Journal of Marxist Thought and Opinion in the U.S.

POLITICAL AFFAIRS

Theoretical Organ of the Communist Party, USA

Authoritative articles and editorials on American foreign policy and the cold war, economic conditions in the U.S., the continuing struggle for Negro equality, nuclear testing and the armaments race, trade unions and the working class, culture and the ideological struggle, NATO and the Common Market, and other key political developments.

Annual subscription $5.00
(Additional for Foreign Postage $1.00)

NEW ERA BOOK AND SUB AGENCY
832 Broadway, New York 3, N.Y., U.S.A.

SELECTED MILITARY WRITINGS OF MAO TSE-TUNG

(in English)

This book contains twenty-nine of Mao Tse-tung's important military writings during the period from October 1928 to April 1949.

410 pages
22.2 × 15.2 cm.

Cloth cover: 8/9
Cardboard cover: 5/9

French and Spanish editions will soon be available

Published by
FOREIGN LANGUAGES PRESS, Peking, China

Distributed by
GUOZI SHUDIAN, P.O. Box 399, Peking, China

Printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Aldenham, Herts.

STAND BY OUR LEADERS!

A statement by the Editorial Board of
'THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST'

On July 11, 1963 'special branch' policemen—Vorster's Gestapo—raided a house in Rivonia, near Johannesburg, and arrested 18 men and women. Those arrested include Walter Sisulu, former general secretary of the banned African National Congress, who was in hiding after being sentenced to six years' jail for carrying on A.N.C. activity, Govan Mbeki and Raymond Mhlaba, who until outlawed were known as outstanding leaders of the A.N.C. in Port Elizabeth, ex-treason trialist and house-arrestee, 'Rusty' Bernstein, and noted Indian youth leader Ahmed Kathrada. The arrested people are all being held in jail under the notorious '90 day' section of the 1963 General Laws Amendment Act, which provides for detention without charge or trial, without visitors or access to lawyers. The police announced that this was one of the 'most important round-ups so far,' and that they had 'smashed the underground headquarters of the African National Congress.' Other police statements indicate that charges may be framed under the 'Sabotage Act', which could carry a death sentence.

THE EDITORIAL BOARD OF 'THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST' HAS ADOPTED THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT . . .

STAND BY O

IT WOULD BE a mistake to underestimate the gravity of the latest news from South Africa. In capturing Walter Sisulu and his brave companions the Fascists have dealt a bitter blow at South Africa—the real South Africa that strives and longs for freedom.

We may now expect the biggest frame-up in South African history—not excluding even the marathon treason trial of 1956-61. And, let there be no mistake, such a 'trial' would take place in conditions infinitely worse than were then the case. Since that time the South African white supremacy state has taken long strides towards a Nazi-type police dictatorship of naked lawlessness and terrorism. With a press that has been effectively muzzled or suppressed, a cowed and subservient judiciary, and armed with 'laws' that contradict the very concept of legality, Nazi Vorster will no doubt go out to make the 'trial' a demonstration to whip up to hysteria the fear and panic of the White population and to terrorise the non-Whites into submission to slavery.

The lurid imaginations of the special branch of the police will be given free rein—certainly they are already hard at work fabricating 'evidence' of fantastic plots—in court proceedings which will be nothing but a travesty of those in civilised countries. It cannot be excluded by any means that even the death penalty may be demanded by South Africa's bloodthirsty rulers and we must say with all soberness and realism that the very lives of Walter Sisulu and those who have been arrested with him, many of whose names have become household words in South Africa and brilliant and fearless champions of democracy for all, are now in mortal danger.

Only one thing can avert this ghastly tragedy and save these fine South Africans—true sons of our people, African, White and Indian—from judicial murder. And that is a mighty tide of solidarity and determination through the world of all who value justice and human rights. This applies in the first place, of course, to the people of South Africa themselves. And already they have begun—the slogan 'Free Sisulu!' has appeared on the walls of Germiston and other South African towns.

R LEADERS!

To the millions upon millions of true friends of South African freedom throughout the world we appeal at this time to raise a mighty campaign of solidarity which even the hardened fascists of South Africa will not be able to resist. The peoples of Africa and the world, have already shown so much understanding and friendship for the cause of Free South Africa. To all of them we say: Walter Sisulu, great African patriot, and his friends are your brothers. We look to you to join with us in the struggle to save them, just as much as if your very own brother or sister were now in Verwoerd's dungeons.

When the Treason Trial began, the people of our country rallied behind the slogan *STAND BY OUR LEADERS*! Defying police bullets vast masses of brave men and women demonstrated before the Johannesburg Drill Hall; all over South Africa the people demonstrated, protested, came out on mass strikes. Today it is not only South Africans who say 'Stand By Our Leaders'—for the cause of Walter Sisulu and his fellow-victims of Verwoerd fascism is the cause of the whole world; it is on the conscience of every free man and woman everywhere.

We cannot doubt that the enemy will go all out to make use of this incident in an attempt to spread demoralisation, lack of confidence and disunity in the ranks of those who stand for and believe in freedom. They must not and shall not be allowed to succeed in this purpose. If the enemy is banking on splits in our ranks at this crucial stage he has forgotten what sort of people we South African freedom fighters are, non-Communist and Communist alike.

The masses of our people know very well that these leaders and all others who have been captured by the enemy in the cause of freedom are their champions. They know that they have risked and sacrificed everything to realise the aspirations which are common to the entire African people and indeed to the great majority of the population as a whole. They are the heroes of the masses, and this new blow of the hated dictators only makes them more precious to and loved by the masses. The people know that the prisons of Vorster are filled with those whose only crime was that they fought fearlessly and brilliantly

for freedom, and they regard them as casualties captured on the field of battle.

No doubt errors may have been committed—what great struggle is without mistakes?—and those whose duty it is to do so will no doubt in due course soberly examine these in order to draw the necessary lessons from them. But it is necessary to rebuff those who dare to criticise 'recklessness' from the shelter of their own passivity, and to remind them that without daring men, ready to take necessary risks, there will be no end to the tyranny.

This is no time for despondency or recriminations: it is a time for renewed dedication, unity and solidarity among all who hold the cause of our people dear. Anyone who, from whatever subjective motives gives way at this time to backbiting and groundless speculations, or indulges in splitting tendencies of any kind, is in fact playing the game of the enemy. Now more than ever is the time to close the ranks, to cement still closer the unity built up and achieved in long and glorious years of common sacrifice and struggle.

Thus—and only thus—can we show that the rejoicing of Verwoerd and Vorster is premature and misplaced—and turn this setback into a victory. Vorster boasts that he has 'destroyed' the freedom movements of our country—which he calls 'subversive.' You are wrong, Mr. Vorster. These movements can never be destroyed, because they are a part of the people, flesh of their flesh, blood of their blood. Every fresh blow can only serve to strengthen us, to bring our great movements closer to one another and closer to the people.

We shall avenge every criminal act you commit against our heroes and our leaders. We shall redouble our efforts to work with passion, devotion and single-minded discipline to speed the day of liberation and retribution.

Long live Walter Sisulu!

Long live all fighters for freedom in the jails of the criminal Verwoerd regime!

Mayibuye i' Afrika!

The Editorial Board

THE AFRICAN COMMUNIST

Printed by Farleigh Press Ltd. (T.U. all depts.), Aldenham, Herts.